

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Date: 17th October 2016

Time: 16.30pm

Venue: MR4/5 SUHQ

Meeting Quorum: 10

MINUTES

Circulation:

Luke Pilot, Hope Worsdale, Becky Gittins, Chloe Wynne, Marissa Beatty, Ted Crowson, Nathaniel Shiers, Sam Fry, Emily Dunford, Sophie Worrall, Dammy Sokale, Jonas Eberhardt, Richard Adetunji, James Hunt, Emma Cox, Nyasha Pitt, Graham Parker, Helen Timbrell, Jacqui Clements, Tracey Grant, David Dedman, Faye Lloyd.

1.1.O APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
Helen Timbrell, Emily Dunford

1.2.O DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST
EP declared a conflict of interest in agenda item number 1.12.0 SUSS briefing.
The Sabbatical Team declared a conflict of interest in agenda item number 1.4.C Pay Scale proposals.

1.3.O MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING – OPEN

Resolved: That the open minutes of the 20th July 2016 and the 14th September 2016 were approved as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

1.4.O MATTERS ARISING
None.

1.5.O CHAIRS BUSINESS

- Autumn elections taking place, voting opens tomorrow.

1.6.O

END OF YEAR MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS

Paper noted.

TG reported key surplus movements against original budget as follows:

Central Admin & General Overheads - delays in recruitment, underspend in heat/light/water, £19K saving in VAT, insurance provision of £17K released.

Membership Services – Delay in Advice and Welfare Department and Student Activities Department recruitment and general savings.

Venue & Technical Services – Increased ticket sales and improved control of costs.

Societies and Clubs – release of provision for debts, and additional memberships.

Premises – general savings.

Other trading – income achieved in consultancy and conference business – increase in bar sales in July as a result of BUCS and Amicon conferences.

Recommendation to increase the building refurbishment reserve by £250K discussed.

EC raised the issue of current requirements, could the money be better spent reducing the current liability and addressing current student requirements. **EC** raised the issue of the Sports Manager post for which she felt there was a good case, why was this proposal not going ahead.

JC referred to the CEO report in which there was information regarding plans around building redevelopment. Building has long been deemed not fit for purpose, looking for quite a period of time to obtain traction with the University about longer term plans for the whole of the area and the SUHQ building. Clear steer recently received from the VC and other members of the new senior team that there could be plans for the long term vision of this whole area of the campus including both SU buildings, requirement to start visioning what that may look like within the next ten years. Some movement seen on some of the critical pieces of work required in both buildings, flooring, the cellar floor, Curiositea heating, received confirmation from the University that they will carry out the work and they will pick up the costs as the landlord. University have advised that next summer they would be looking to carry out some of the work in this building that is a landlord cost e.g. replacement carpets, redecoration, remedial work around the heating and windows; this has presented an opportunity for the Students' Union to potentially add to that to improve the building further, this would be planned for next summer, the current students would benefit from this, essential expenditure only, if any revenue remaining expenditure on some of the big strategic projects will be considered, significant work required to reengineer

the website, that is a project that is likely to come to the Board in the future.

Website expenditure not incorporated into the £250K. Reserves figure £1.5m, target reserves figure just under £800K, this is designated reserves.

NSh – The reserves policy should be driving what we are looking to make in the surplus rather than the surplus driving what our reserves policy should be I can see the opportunity in terms of the building but I do not think it is a decision to be taken in isolation, if we want to revisit the reserves policy let's look at the options.

TG reported that the Students' Union had been building a new financial strategy and were now targeting a much smaller surplus, ideally within a half a percent of the commercial income.

JC - the recommendation had been made based on the Strategic Plan, one of the big strategic projects is the building, the idea being we were taking what was over and above the risk level of reserves that we need stating these are some of the strategic projects we may need to invest in based on the Strategic Plan we have already approved, it's very much about trying to invest in the future of the students and making sure the Students' Union is doing that now based on what the strategy says, it is important to state that this is a designated reserve.

JH – the recommendation is sensible it does not have a major impact on our financial posture. It is important details of any spending on the building come back to the Board of Trustees so that it can be judged against EC's comments, how far are those improvements benefiting students in comparison to other things the students do in the same vein.

NP acknowledged the points raised by EC and JH, and the explanation behind the current recommendation. NP acknowledged that given the current economic climate the Students' Union may not have the opportunity in the future to invest so heavily in the fabric of the building and given the University interest it was worth considering at this stage.

GP supportive of the recommendation, but considered it would be prudent to postpone a decision until after the Five Year Plan presentation.

Resolved: Following the Five Year Plan presentation and discussion the Board of Trustees **approved**, unanimously the increase in the designated building reserve by £250K to £500K.

Matters for decision/discussion

1.7.O FIVE YEAR PLAN OPEN

Papers noted.

JC detailed the background information that had resulted in the changes to the final budget proposal and delay in the final budget approval process.

Presentation received (see attached).

Discussion took place.

EC raised the issue of the community project, had the Board of Trustees not previously approved the post subject to University funding.

EC's understanding was confirmed as being correct

Community Engagement – University committed to this, the Students' Union looking to take control, consulted with local stakeholders including the University, there are a lot of different challenging views about what this post should be, requirement for the Students' Union to be in the driving seat as the Students' Union know what is best for the students, this needs to be the focus of this role.

University would argue that the Annual Allocation is their money, they are very supportive but they like the fact that the Students' Union would be in the driving seat.

EP acknowledged and was happy with the explanation behind the funding of the role, it was noted that the original comment was made as a point of principle as the Students' Union had originally said that this would be University funded.

It was noted that the project was specific to the South Leamington area. It was further noted that a number of Student Unions across the country employ similar posts, and that wide consultation had taken place.

JE raised the question of the increase in costs to £47K in the second year.

JC reported that this was in respect of a second post, the Students' Union would be looking to replicate in Coventry, at that stage there would be proof of the concept, the Students' Union could then go back to the University for funding.

BG reported that the Democracy and Education Policy Manager would be looking for the post to have a hot desk in the Democracy Office and that the University were keen for their facility in Leamington to incorporate a hot desk for the community role.

NSh raised the issue of the organisations structure, given the strategic issues that will be ongoing in the area of education over the next two years would education and democracy be the best fit, has consideration been given to other departments in the organisation?

The concern was acknowledged but it was considered that currently this would be the best fit, however further consideration would be given in terms of planning moving forward, particularly in light of discussions on structures needed to deliver the overall plan.

EC in agreement with the proposals but of the opinion that there was still a strong case for Sports Manager post as well given the additional funding from BUCS and the increasing workload.

JC reported that currently one of the areas of concern around the Sports Manager post was the ability to take a more strategic approach in the department at the time and fundamentally making the changes that need to be made. One of the reasons for the proposal was based around the internal audit report and the requirement to focus time and energy on dealing with the issues raised, at which point the Students' Union would know exactly what the requirement would be with regards to the post and the resource to enable things to move forward, this post will enable the changes to take place. Requirement to consider other areas of the organisation that may require resource to enhance areas such as education, democratic services, the student voice aspect, if considering two additional roles in the Student Activities Department.

EC raised the issue of risk management and cost benefit to student activities and the student experiences, to enhance and streamline would it not make a real difference to students and staff, would the role of Sports Manager not facilitate this.

DD reported that there was currently a capacity issue within the Student Activity Department, the transformation project one aspect of that, issues largely around societies as opposed to clubs, number of societies and critically the amount of activity that they undertake if workload continues to increase at its current rate additional staff resource will be required. Capacity issues some of which the Sports Manager could potentially address freeing up some management time.

TC noted that in terms of sports the transitional aspect of online form filling would free up a lot of resource from the Sports Co-Ordinator and the Sports Officer.

EC acknowledged the points raised, in agreement with the transformation project, however capacity issue would remain for the first twelve months before the transformation and website projects began to have an impact.

JC to consider additional proposal with regards to additional resource in this department for the forthcoming twelve months.

Resolved:

The assumptions set out in Appendix 1 including the proposed target surplus of £26k, noted.

The risks set out in Appendix 2, noted.

The revised overall 2016-17 budget assessed and approved.

To consider additional proposal with regards to capacity issues within the Student Activities Department. To be brought back to a further meeting

1.8.O

ANNUAL ALLOCATION LETTER

Paper noted.

Resolved: Proposed letter considered, terms of the grant **approved**, unanimously.

1.9.O

STRATEGIC PLAN & KPI's 2016-2017

Papers noted. Presentation received.

It was noted that strategic sessions had been booked into the diaries for next year, JC requested feedback with regards to what specific topics the Board would like to see on the agenda at these meetings.

Discussion took place, potential areas for further discussion identified as

- Post Graduates
- NSS score and the implications/broader academic strategy
- Data collection and access to
- Website/Communication
- Designated reserves
- Curriculum development

SW raised the issue of student participation, specifically in relation to the Copper Rooms, JC offered for SW to liaise directly with SR, Commercial Operations Director.

Resolved: KPI's for 2016 – 2017 **approved**, unanimously.

1.10.O

WARWICK SU KPI'S 2015 - 2016

Papers noted.

JC reported outcomes driven by some of the discussions taken place in terms of the areas that the Students' Union were looking to move forward and what the programmes of work will look like.

JC happy to discuss further outside of the meeting.

EC congratulated all the staff involved.

Resolved: Progress against targets noted.

Matters for information

1.11.O

NUS CHARITY BOARD

Paper noted.

JC left the meeting to enable a discussion to take place.

The Board of Trustees discussed the paper. The Board of Trustees recognised the potential benefits the appointment could bring to Warwick Students' Union.

Resolved: The NUS Charity Trustees role undertaken by the Chief Executive noted.

1.12.O SUSS BRIEFING
Paper noted.

1.13.O COMMITTEE CHAIRS FEEDBACK – OPEN

- **Audit & Risk**
Nothing to report.
- **Finance & HR**
LP reported that an additional meeting had been set up for the beginning of November 2016 to receive a proposal with regards to a new outlet in the Students' Union.

1.14.O ANY OTHER BUSINESS – OPEN

1.14.0.1 PPF Levy

TG reported invoice received and paid.

Time and Date of Next Meeting: Noted.