

## HR Subcommittee Minutes

6<sup>th</sup> September 2022, 10am

Location: Online

Members: Lorraine Teague (LT), External Trustee, Leilani-Gabrielle Courtney (LC), Officer Trustee, Tom Hillen, Officer Trustee (TH), Sarah Kerton, Guild Director (SK)

In Attendance: N/A

Apologies:

Minutes: Cassie O'Boyle

Item	
1	Introduction and Administration
1.1	LT introduced the meeting and welcomed TH and LC to the HR Subcommittee. The meeting was quorate. There were no apologies to note.
1.2	A conflict of interest was declared for all paid members of Guild Staff regarding the Cost-of-Living paper and LJC as a board member for UCB.
1.3	<del>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 18 May 2022 were approved, subject to LT made some minor amendments made by LT. to the minutes, and these were approved.</del> There were no matters arising not covered in the papers already, other than those related to the TOR <del>and Officers' 360s, which</del> SK agreed to circulate.  <b>Action/Decision:</b> SK to send LTR the amended Terms of Reference that was completed at the last meeting <del>and the Officers 360s.</del>
1.4	The board received the action log.
2	Standing Items
2.1	SK highlighted that things were going well in the Guild and that she was now seeing positive changes to the culture of the Guild. She also flagged that alignment between the staff and officer team and the one-team approach with the team is going strength to strength. LT provided positive feedback on the newsletter sent by SK and hearing about how residential had gone. LC said she had felt the culture shift and that this was positive.  SK flagged the difference between TAW and IIP in terms of time commitment and difficulty to complete. SK noted the board should consider if we do want to go to Silver/Gold TAW due to <del>difficulties encountered with the cost of</del> this.  The board also noted SK's involvement in the NUS board and the time commitment associated with her role now as they are going through a process related to Anti-Semitism allegations.
2.2	The board noted the safeguarding report.
2.3	The board noted the reporting summary.
3	Projects and Workplans
3.1	SK presented the People and Culture Update. She highlighted that this work is embedded within the Guild and is not just an add on. Feedback from IIP was positive and our submission was well received by our lead in the IIP team.

	<p>Out of the process, there were a few areas that were identified as improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unified values set for Staff and Officers</li> <li>• Developing a process around performance management</li> <li>• Management of knowledge</li> <li>• Reward and recognition</li> <li>• Two accreditations – QSU and IIP Silver</li> </ul> <p><b>Action/Decision:</b> COB to ensure that everyone can access the IIP plan.  <b>Action/Decision:</b> The HR Subcommittee approved the People and Culture Update and plan for the year ahead.</p>
3.2	<p>The board received the annual plan, which all the board will also see in the Trustee Board. SK noted “100% great people supported to do great things” and “a well-run and governed union” as core areas that were of interest to HR Subcommittee.</p> <p>LC noted that she believed we were focusing in the right areas as it was linked to our values. In terms of if we received an increase in funding, the board agreed that this would be a process of upscaling as opposed to changing what we do.</p> <p>SK highlighted volunteer development as a potential area of development. LC noted this was something she was passionate about as an opportunity to develop and give back to our community of students. TH flagged the importance of giving opportunities for volunteers to progress. The board discussed the importance of volunteer development and that this was something important to them.</p>
3.3	<p>SK presented the Guild values. These were developed and identified after reflection on the year previous and most importantly, looking at the annual plan and how these align and live throughout.</p> <p>LT noted that we should look at how we keep “forged in our city” and “by students, for students” etc. as these are a powerful part of marketing who we are and what we do.</p> <p>SK agreed that the next part of the work in this area was updating the values-based behaviours.</p> <p><b>Action/Decision:</b> The board approved the Guild values.</p>
3.4	<p>SK presented the Officer Accountability report. She highlighted that in the previous year, there was a deficit model from trying to manage behaviour. However, moving forward, SK flagged that this should be a core part of our work and a project for us to look at. This should look at accountability to students, to each other, and to the Guild.</p> <p>Both TH and LC provided feedback on their experience on 2021-22. TH flagged that what was missing was communication to society leaders/student leaders about what was happening in the Guild. It also needs to be clear how to put in a complaint and who to find and where, who to go for what etc. TH noted that this should be able to be private. LC noted that having proper mechanisms in place to also hold our student leaders accountable is important.</p> <p><b>Action/Decision:</b> SK to investigate what to do if we lose an Officer throughout the year and can/how you should replace them.</p>
3.5	<p>SK presented the Cost-of-Living report to HR subcommittee. This had already been to the Finance Subcommittee. Finance Sub have agreed their approach and the “envelope” of</p>

	<p>money that would be available for this. Finance Sub had recommended and agreed a separate <u>timing</u> approach for career staff and officers.</p> <p>SK recommended a 5.1% increase for cost of living. SK flagged that there were other ways that we were supporting staff with the cost-of-living crisis including things like when staff should travel to work or offering loans to staff.</p> <p>LT asked what happened with the conversations with the increase previously. SK updated that there was a conversation with UCB and finance subcommittee about a cost-of-living increase and it was decided that we would not map directly against the Universities policy.</p> <p>LC flagged her work that she was doing on the cost of living as an Officer and that it was clear that there was an impact being had on staff and officers at this time. TH agreed that the increase of 5.1% is reasonable.</p> <p><b>Action/Decision:</b> The HR subcommittee agreed to recommend awarding a 5.1% increase.</p>
4	Policy and procedures
	<p><b>Action/Decision:</b> The HR subcommittee approved the policy amendments submitted.</p>
5	AOB
	<p>LT raised the TOR for HR Subcommittee and asked for a timetable to be completed for things that they are responsible for including Director Appraisal, Staff Surveys, Stress Management Questions, Pay Scales etc.</p> <p><u>Noted that the Subcommittee's remit also includes reviewing its own effectiveness and that consideration had previously been given to this and to a review of the effectiveness of the board as a whole.</u> In terms of Peer Reviews, SK was keen to look at other organisations for us to work with on this as <del>opposed to</del> <u>well as</u> NUS.</p> <p>SK flagged that there is a vacancy on HR subcommittee at the moment but that once we recruit student trustees in October, we can take a look at who joins the committee.</p> <p><b>Action/Decision:</b> SK to create an <u>-timetable</u> for activity for HR Subcommittee. <del>for the year ahead.</del></p>