

UCB Guild Trustee Board

30th October 2019, 11am

Location: University Boardroom (TBC)

Members: Officer Trustee, Ross Loveitt (RL); Officer Trustee, Alpha Jallow (AJ); Student Trustee, Paula Couto (PC); External Trustee, Lorraine Teague (LT); External Trustee, Andy Parsons (AP) [Chair]

In Attendance: Guild Manager, Sarah Kerton (SK); Representation and Advocacy Coordinator, Cassie O'Boyle (COB)

Apologies: Student Trustee, Ashlea-Jayne Mallett (AJM)

Item	Title
1.1	AP prompted a round of introductions for the benefit of the board because there were some new members joining the Trustee Board. Apologies were received for AJM.
1.2	AP welcomed AJ and PC to the board as new members.
1.3	AP gave a brief introduction to what the boards function is and what conflicts of interest are. AP also encouraged all members of the board to interject and engage in any conversation throughout the meeting. No conflicts of interest were declared.
1.4	<p>AP introduced the Action Log that had been circulated. Regarding risk-assessments, AP noted the responsibility of the board with regards to risk assessment. SK highlighted the introduction of new health and safety staff within the University including a new safeguarding officer. Currently, the Guild are covered by current processes with a pack going to the next HR sub-committee to review documentation.</p> <p>Action: SK to circulate the risk register to the trustee board for the next meeting.</p> <p>Action: SK to circulate any updated or changed polices and procedures from UCB to the HR sub-committee for the next meeting.</p> <p>AP noted that sharing the Guild's risks with the University is important and this provides the Guild with an opportunity to ask for assistance and advice in relation to mitigation.</p> <p>All other actions from the action log were covered in the agenda and were discussed later in the meeting.</p>

1.5	The board approved the minutes of the previous meetings from February and May with minor edits.
1.6	REDACTED.
2.1	<p>AJ updated that Officer training had been a particularly positive experience for the development of the executive team. They developed their values together and worked as a team within the week to develop relationships with one another. The executive officers thanked and congratulated SK on organising and delivering this week. AJ also updated on the work delivered on societies and that while this was a big cultural change, the new systems of funding and support have been successful. SK highlighted Eco Society as an example of strength within this system.</p>
2.2	<p>SK provided a verbal presentation from the Board focused on the things that she has learnt at UCB. The presentation included block grant analysis. The average University receives £71 per student and in comparison, UCB Guild receives £22 per student, this does not include FE students and so in reality the Guild are funded at approximately £14.66 per head. University College Birmingham Guild of Students are the lowest funded in the country. SK noted that having less money was, however, not an excuse to not perform, but a reason to be more strategic, tactical and efficient with the funding the Guild does receive.</p> <p>SK noted how excellently the Officer team had been working together and that the students at UCB are the greatest asset to both organisations.</p> <p>REDACTED</p> <p>AP commented that the new website has taken a substantial amount of work to get up and running and this has been a success for the Guild team. The website is now creating an image of the Guild being modern, easy to engage with and up to date.</p> <p>REDACTED</p> <p>AP acknowledged the work that is happening to ensure financial independence.</p>

3.1	Key updates from the Finance Subcommittee were covered in items on the agenda.
3.2	<p>AP noted the role of the subcommittee is to go into more detail than the board itself but highlighted a need for proper scrutiny of the group. This would be supported by the updated terms of reference to ensure there are good systems of risk management and finances. The board agreed that the terms of reference included appropriate information on the accountability links with University Corporation. The board agreed to remove 1.4.13 from the TOR as this should be in the HR TOR rather than finance. Regarding voting within the subcommittees, it was agreed that if there was a substantial disagreement, the item would be referred to the trustee board for discussion. The board approved the terms of reference with amendments.</p> <p>Action: SK to circulate the minutes of the previous finance committee for the trustee board to read.</p>
3.3	<p>SK met with the University to discuss the management accounts. The University are expected to produce these, and Amanda (Counter Culture) is currently chasing the progress of these. Amanda is going to compile these accounts and SK is ensuring the University are supporting this process. AP noted that the University provided some end of year accounts, but these were not in an accessible format. SK agreed that these were not within the format needed for submission to the charity commission and the data would need to be changed for CC to develop suitable accounts. This would have a cost implication and the board agreed that the accounts should be compliant with the charity commissions standards. The board noted there were multiple levels of rigour needed depending on the size of a charity and while the Guild are currently help to a reduced standard for the Charity Commission, the board agreed that they would prepare their paperwork to the next-level standard. AP noted this was an opportunity to show the University the Guild's professional development.</p>
3.4	<p>The year to date financials needed to be circulated to the board as a matter of urgency. SK noted she is confident that the financial system will be in place for next Trustee board meeting and these accounts could be produced for then.</p>
3.5	<p>SK provided a paper regarding the Guild's bank account. REDACTED</p>
4.1	<p>LT updated the board on the HR subcommittee. LT noted there had been two meetings of the subcommittee so far which have focused predominately on ensuring Guild policies</p>

	were in order. SK noted that once the subcommittee has approved all the updated policies and procedures, the board will receive a full pack to approve. AP highlighted it was worth investigating how the Guild's grievance procedure and the Universities complaints procedure interact. LT confirmed the employer's liability insurance was up to date and displayed as it should be.
4.2	The same edits as were made to the finance subcommittee TOR were made regarding voting. The board approved the terms of reference.
4.3	The appraisal for the Guild Manager was noted as part of the responsibility of the HR subcommittee and LT and AP were happy to lead on the development of a process related to this.
4.4	SK updated the board that after a conversation with NUS, it was concluded that it would not be possible for the Guild to access the NUS pension. However, there is a possibility that the Guild could access the Agean pension (the NUS provider) and have the same package as other Students' Union's but it would not be related to the other pensions across the country within the NUS scheme. SK declared a conflict of interest in relation to pension discussions, but assured the board that Amanda wrote the recommendations as a result. The board discussed the links between pension and pay role and noted that it would not be cheaper to use the UCB pay role system and that the pension costs would also be considerably higher. AP asked the most convenient and best way to provide permanent staff with a stable pension and SK confirmed this would be through the NEST scheme. The board agreed that in the future it may be possible to move to the Agean scheme but in the meantime, the board approved the NEST pension that is linked into the Counter Culture system.
4.5	SK updated the board on the development of staffing proposals for the Guild moving forward. It was noted that the development coordinator role had changed substantially since the recruitment of COB and that this role should link into the prioritisation exercise undertaken by the executive. In response to challenges the Guild are facing currently, SK proposed that the Trustee board approve the recruitment of a coordinator level role rather than somebody to lead on strategic level work. REDACTED AP was keen to ensure that student engagement and commercial development were working as one and the board agree that this should be the aim of the new role. The board also agreed some

	<p>administrative support should be brought in to ensure that the Guild Manager was not having to take on admin tasks not within their remit. The funding for the development coordinator is already included in the budget as it is to replace a staff member that left. The board agreed the new role would be a coordinator level with commercial within their remit as well as a focus on developing student communities. This would be on a flexible pay scale and SK welcomed feedback from the board in terms of recruitment ideas and what would need to be tested within the recruitment process.</p>
5	<p>SK presented a verbal update in the changing landscape of Higher and Further Education in the U.K. The topics included Brexit, the General Election, the Office for Students and other regulatory bodies such as Ofsted and QAA. SK noted there is uncertainty in relation to the Augar review but that there would be substantial consequences for a University like UCB. The FE Kitemark would provide a significant area of growth capability for FE courses and the Guild would need to ensure student voice was fed into this process. Regarding Access and Widening Participation, the Guild raised concerns related to the increasing BME attainment gap which breaks the national trend of a steady decrease. AP asked how the Guild plan on addressing these issues from a policy development point of view. SK noted it could be a possibility to develop a working group on access and widening participation within the Guild.</p>
7.1	<p>The Relationship agreement was circulated to the board as a first draft. SK welcomed feedback from trustees and the board agreed trustees would send edits or feedback via e-mail to SK. Once these edits have been completed, this will be put forward to the University for discussion.</p>
7.2	<p>The board received a verbal presentation from COB around the development of CBS and where the research conducted by COB was at currently. This included the development of 9 Course Based Societies with a committee of 4 students and 1 staff champion. This also included linking up the academic voice and community building priorities of the Guild. The board were keen to receive updates on this project throughout the year.</p>
8.1	<p>The officers provided a verbal presentation for the board on their year so far. This included key wins such as 1000 students at the FE fair, 800 at freshers, 650 at the community day and 450 at the sports day. AP congratulated the officer on their presentation and the work they have done so far.</p>

9.1	SK encouraged the board to send thoughts via e-mail on the skills matrix that she has developed as some additional categories may need to be considered.
9.2	SK noted recruitment of 2 student trustees had been completed but there was potential for an additional external trustee if this is something the board wanted to consider.
10	No additional business was raised.
10.1	The date of the next meeting was confirmed as