

# Minutes

Subject:	Management Committee Minutes: 7 January 2019
Produced by:	Tony Moore
To:	Management Committee
Action:	To approve
Status	<b>For publication</b>
Paper:	MC 18.19 19

Present: Georgina Burchell (GB), Jenna Chapman (JC), Toby Cunningham (TCU), Oli Gray (OG), Martin Marko (MM)

In attendance: Tony Moore (TM), Josh Clare (JCL)

Chair: Sophie Atherton (SA)

Apologies: Caroline Wilson (CW), Tim Cave (TCA),

## Executive Summary

- Agreed to a half way position between Answer 2 and 3 to Question 1 in the NUS proposal asking for the abolition of the VP Union Development post
- Agreed to Answer 1 to Question 2 with a proviso that greater clarity be given as to opt-ins to commercial services
- Agreed to Answer 2 to Question 3 but with reservations as to the viability of the proposed cabinet and manifesto

### MC 159 Response to NUS Turnaround Board's options for reform

SA noted that the submissions would need to be in, the following day, which was why the emergency meeting had been called.

SA noted that SOC had asked for some changes to the original wording of the draft response.

JCL advised that the draft set out the Union's affinity with the NUS but recognised that the Turnaround Board's proposal was reactive to the present crisis rather than being a long-term strategic plan.

JCL noted they had not checked whether there was any word limit; if there were, the response might have to be edited down.

JCL advised the Committee would have to decide whether they were making a corporate response or an individual political one.

JCL noted that the NUS paper required answers to three questions:

1. What should the NUS FTO roles be and how many should there be
2. What should the membership model be
3. Is the current balance of deliberation vs action right

JC wondered why the draft response had gone to SOC.

SA noted that it was to give the Committee a steer but that the FTOs, as Trustees, would have ultimate ownership of the response.

TCU advised that the Committee should bear in mind that they would have no power over how individual delegates to NUS national conference would act.

### **Question 1**

SA thought that the Union's response to the Turnaround Board's alternate answers to Question One would be somewhere between Answer 2 and Answer 3: having between 7 and 12 FTOs.

TCU advised that the Committee could opt for having, say, 10 FTOs.

GB Believed it important to keep the Liberations positions.

TCU cautioned that, if the Committee were to opt for more FTOs, this might undermine the Union's responses to Questions 2 and 3. TCU advised that, if conference were to throw out the Turnaround Board's proposals and the Company Law meeting were to opt for a different course, the Board might overrule conference.

JCL advised, it was highly likely, that conference would vote for Answer 3 and all candidates for national office would do likewise.

JC thought, in an ideal world, one would go for Answer 3.

MM noted that the international officer had been taken out of all the Answers and the intention was to abolish the post. MM wondered why there was the intention to keep the nations officers but to abolish the liberations posts.

SA believed the importance of having an international officer, in what was a short term proposal, was self-evident given the rise in hate crimes affecting international students triggered by the current Brexit environment.

JCL advised that posts had grown over recent years and the Turnaround Board were asking SUs where they thought cuts should be made.

TCU cited, for example, the debate over whether it would be the Union's stance to ask for a welfare officer and an international officer at the expense of some of the liberations posts.

GB noted that an argument had been made for a possible reduction in the LGBT+ posts.

JCL advised that the Trans post, for example, had been introduced to counter the premiering of the interests of white, gay men and had funding in place so would be, particularly, hard to make redundant.

The Committee concluded that they would recommend a half way position between Answer 2 and Answer 3 and opt for 10 FTOs.

MM reiterated concerns as the national presidents being part of all the proposed options.

JCL advised that, in the nations outside of England, there was a higher proportion of small FE SUs which needed the representation and associated financial support that came from having national representation: effectively, the better funded HE English SU's helped their poorer FE counterparts in the student movement.

Committee members could find no compelling reason to retain the VP Union Development post.

The Committee opted for a position between Answer 2 and 3 but agreed that only one role (Union Development) should be cut.

### ***Question 2***

SA noted that SOC had unanimously opted for Answer 1.

TCU advised that this should also include a request for clarity on what "opt in" would mean, in reality, for organisations who have a large trading and commercial output.

The Committee opted for Answer 1 to the question with the proviso that the above request be included.

### ***Question 3***

SA noted that SOC had favoured Answer 1.

TCI advised that the Committee might consider whether the retention of an almost full complement of Officers that they had asked for would sit well with the provision for a NUS cabinet and manifesto.

SA asked that the above reservations should be included in the response.

The Committee opted for Answer 1 to the question with the proviso that the above reservation be included.

### ***General Comments***

The Committee asked that the request for the NUS to start "addressing organisational cultures and norms" should be changed to "addressing organisational cultures and behaviours".

The Committee asked that the response should be addressed as coming from UEASU Management Committee.