Trustee Board
Minutes
18th November 2016, 13.45pm
Green Templeton College

Present: Eden Bailey (EB) VP Access and Academic Affairs, Alexander Bishop (AB)
Student Trustee, Bethany Currie (BC) VP Charities and Community, Sandy Downs (SD)
VP Welfare and Equal Opportunities, Tom Flynn (TF) External Trustee, Jack Hampton
(JHa) Chair, James Hunt (JHu) External Trustee, Harini Iyengar (HI) External Trustee,
Richard Jackson (RJ) External Trustee, Marina Lambrakis (ML) VP Graduates, Oliver
Rice (OR) Student Trustee, Orla White (OW) VP Women, Benji Woolf (BW) Student
Trustee.

In Attendance:
Ryan Bird (RB) CEO, Melanie Richardson (MR) Office Manager.

JHa suggests that the final timetable entry for the day be cancelled due to subjects
being covered in the morning session. Welcomes both Ryan and Oliver, the new CEO
and Student Trustee respectively.

1. Apologies

None.

2. Minutes from the previous meeting (Paper 1)

The minutes were approved by the board.

3. Matters arising not covered elsewhere

None.

4. CEO's Report (Paper 2)

RB gives an overview of the CEO report.

Key points:

- Senior management team have discussed developing a 6-month plan for this
  term.
- A strategy and planning cycle for future years will hopefully be in place by the
  end of this 6-month period.
- Elections and transition of officers is a priority to understand/look at for next year.
- There are no financials in the report.

RB will update the Board on any changes to elections and officer transition after the data collection phase.

Financial report will be delivered in due course and will be discussed at the finance sub-committee.

TF explains that part of the role of the Board is to support RB, particularly in his first year in post. Money will be set aside for mentoring and coaching.

RJ states that it is useful to have the oversight supplied by the departments. Recommends that, as a board, they should commend the Student Advice Service for successfully obtaining AQS accreditation without any amendments to policies, procedure or practice. ML adds that the same should happen for the Comms department.

JHa to deliver commendations to the Student Advice Service and Communications Department on behalf of the Board.

TF initiates a discussion on the Operations and Events Report (2.2).

Key points:

- (TF) Is there data for the number of students who attended the Freshers' Fair?
- (JHa, ML) Confirmation that the data has been captured and needs to be pulled together into a report.
- (ML) There is less detail in this report as Aman, the Operations and Events Manager, has been covering a lot of tasks in the absence of a CEO.
- (EB) The number of students through the door was around 11,000.

(JHa) Separate report on Freshers' Fair would be brought to the Board at the next meeting.

RJ enquires about the OUSU website.

Key points:

- (RB) Publication of the new website is at the top of Comms priority list.
- (ML) The website has been ready to go since mid-August but the hold ups have been centred around the current hosts, who are based in Germany, and the University.
- (EB) The new launch date for the website is the beginning of HT 2017.

5. **Sabbatical Officers Reports (Paper 3)**

JHa explains that the Sabbatical Officers were asked to submit a short report stating their priorities for the year. Invites questions.

RJ opens discussion on whether the updated governance relating to a limit of 5 campaigns is working.

Key points:

- (SD) 5 is a reasonable limit due to time commitments.
- (BC) The creation of 'super campaigns' set up by the previous VP Charities and Community, was a way get around the limit of having 5 campaigns. This has led to BC chairing 6 campaigns; this is due in part to the role of chair being considered 'boring'.
- (BC) The role of Chair cannot be taken up on a rotation basis.
- (RJ) The cap of 5 should be revisited because the previous problems are being recreated.
- (SD) Some current campaigns feel that they should be under the remit of other sabbatical officers in addition to their formal sponsor.
- (TF) The bye-laws could be stripped and management of campaign numbers could be managed by the Sabbatical Officers team.
- (EB) Requests from students to set up new campaigns are received on a regular basis. Without a set limit, there would be a number of campaigns set up which could not be supported by the sabbatical or staff teams or resourced.
- SD and OW agree that they would be hesitant to create more campaigns under the structure of 'super campaigns'.

Campaign numbers to be brought back as an item at the next Board meeting.

Matt, Membership Services Manager, to be invited into the conversation.

OW opens discussion on the subject of liberation campaigns.

Key points:

- (OW) Some existing OUSU campaigns are looking to become liberation campaigns, such as It Happens Here, Good Night Out and Mind Your Head.
- (OW) There are concerns around following NUS structure for liberation campaigns.
- (SD) Current liberation campaigns in line with the NUS structure are the Oxford Students Disability Community, the Campaign for Racial Awareness and Equality, the Women's Campaign and the LGBTQ Campaign.
- (SD) Mind Your Head would have support to become a liberation campaign due to overlap with the OSDC, although any other campaign which wanted to become a liberations campaign would be provided with the resources to take that request forward.

- (OW) The difference between liberation and none liberation campaigns is that liberation campaigns are not bound by OUSU policy and they get more votes on the executive panel of OUSU council. (ML) This is to avoid OUSU council dictating what these campaigns are doing.
- (EB) There is student demand for a Class Campaign to be introduced as a liberation campaign. At the moment, there isn't a student to run this campaign.
- (ML) Campaign structure could be looked at in terms of campaigns and communities. (TF) If it is a group that is providing services for students (community) then there should be mainly staff support. If the group is a campaign to affect change, then a Sabbatical Officer should be more heavily involved. (EB) Target Schools is a good example of this; it is not necessarily an access campaign; it is a service.
- OW is aware of the issues that may arise from the It Happens Here campaign idea of running support groups for survivors. There could be legal issues with such as service. (ML) This is an issue that has arisen before and is an area of risk for OUSU.

RJ to supply ML with information of when the campaigns were last reviewed.

The Board agrees that subject of liberations campaigns will be revisited at the next meeting.

6. Target Schools Campaign: Action Plan (Paper 4)

ML gives a background to Target Schools.

Key Points:

- Target Schools is an OUSU campaign which runs shadowing days with 6th form students. Last year concerns began to arise regarding risk and, in particular, safeguarding.
- Matt, Membership Service Manager, and EB have developed an action plan to address the issues, which mainly involves training and oversight within OUSU. Lists of the students attending and those who are being shadowed, are submitted to OUSU, along with contact details, before a shadowing day can take place. They also provide OUSU with a timetable of activities.
- Failure by the Target Schools Committee to adhere to the new guidelines set by OUSU will result in the campaign being shut down. The proposals have been accepted by the Target Schools Committee.

JHa opens the discussion to the board.

Key points:

- (EB) One of the main concerns is how Target Schools fits with our charitable aims and objectives. Questions need to be asked as to whether it the best use of

our resources when it comes to our access and outreach work and if outreach work would be better managed by a permanent member of OUSU staff.
- (TF) Target Schools fits with our charitable aims and objectives as it provides opportunities for students. However, it is a group rather than a campaign and should therefore be managed by the staff rather than in the democratic sphere.
- (RB) Comfortable that the risk is being managed.

The paper was approved by the Board.

JHa to pass commendation on to those involved in writing the action plan.

7. Media Services Governance Recommendations (Paper 5)

OW, the Chair of the Media Board, gives an overview of the paper.

Key points:

- The Media Board is currently supposed to be made up of 1 Sabbatical Officer who is not a Chair of OSSL, 2 representatives of the Chief Executive (currently Jo, Communications Manager, and Stephen, Digital Content Coordinator), 2 former editors of the Oxford Student and a former manager of the Oxide Radio. There is currently a problem recruiting the latter two, as many are former students who are no longer interested in OUSU media activity or they are no longer residing in Oxford.
- The three options put forward by the paper are 1) to leave the Board structure as it is 2) to change 'former' editors and station manager to 'current' editors and station manager, or 3) to have no student representation on the Board. Option 2 is the option favoured in the paper.

JHa opens the discussion to the Board.

Key points:

- (RJ) The Media Board was set up as part of governance introduced to assist with the management of the Oxford Student newspaper.
- (TF) Concern that the Media Board has a non-Trustee majority.
- (OW) Media Complaints Panel is made up of the current members of the Media Board. This could potentially be an issue if complaints are made against either the OxStu or Oxide and the current editors/station manager are on the panel. (JHu) Conflicts of this nature must be prevented. (RJ) This was the intention of the current structure.
- (ML) There is hope that the Media Board will function as a form of accountability for our Student Media.
- (ML) There is an issue with the OSSL board in that 4 Sabbatical Officers are on the OSSL Board. This would mean that to create a trustee majority on the Media board, members would need to be Student or External Trustees.

- (TF) Why does the Media Board report to the OSSL Board and not directly to the Trustee Board? (RJ) This can be changed.

The paper was noted by the Board.

OW to report considerations of the Trustee Board to the Media Board.

8. Verbal report on the possibility of OxHub Funding Agreement

BC delivers the verbal report.

Key points:

- There have been discussions between OUSU, members of OxHub, Emma Potts and the Oxford Advisory Board regarding a viable way to move forward. There is the potential for the University to give OUSU a restricted fund into the block grant, which OUSU would then give to OxHub to fund some of their established volunteering programs.
- If we decide that this is something we would like to move forward with. A paper would be taken to the Joint Sub-Committee of Student Members.

JHa opens the discussion to the board.

Key points:

- (JHa) This is a good step in the right direction. If it goes ahead, we should ensure that our branding is included so that we are associated with the activities, get engagement, and are seen to be providing these services to students.
- (RJ) We would need to know how the money is being spent.
- (ML) There would be OUSU oversight of spending. (TF) A contract would be written up by OUSU.

Commendation to BC for her work, the Trustees support the proposals.

9. AOB

JHa outlines the two AOB items, Number of Student Trustees and Chief Executive Probation Period.

JHa gives an overview for the discussion of Student Trustee numbers. Currently OUSU have the provision within the bye-laws to have up to 5 Student Trustees. There have been problems recruiting in the past and so, as a Board, it needs to be decided whether there should be 3, 4 or 5 Student Trustees. Opens discussion to the Board.

Key points:

- (RJ) We need to explain clearly what the role of student trustees is on the Board and show it to be a development opportunity.
- (RJ) Would be happy for the number to be increased to 4 or 5, as long as the Board commits to articulating what the role is all about before we advertise.
- (JHa) Internally we have committed to this. Election committee is working to ensure we are advertising all of the benefits of the role.
- (ML) Could benefit from the brief being rewritten with a focus on employability.
- (AB) Would like to be clear on the benefit of the Student Trustees to the Board.
- (HI) Could be an opportunity to widen representation on the Board.
- (EB) We need to think about diversity and representation. Possible reserved positions for Women and BME applicants.
- (ML) Would like to see a reserved Graduate Trustee place on the Board.
- (JHa) Creation of Student Trusteee working group to discuss.
- (OW) Need to think about diversity and representation. Possible reserved positions for Women and BME applicants. Would it be possible to put this in to the application pack?
- (BW) Students already engaged with OUSU through campaigns do not wish to be involved in the Board. There are differing interests and drives for involvement.
- (AB) Students do not understand what the Trustee Board does.
- (JHa) Supports idea for choice for applicants for which committees they would like to be involved in. Media, complaints etc.

JHa to create Student Trustee working group. This will be made up of the OUSU President and the Student Trustees.

The Board agreed to keep the number of student trustees at 3.

All points to be discussed by the student trustee working group. Any changes will be circulated to the Board.

RJ explains that there is a change to the byelaws going through council, the final reading is next week. The Board must approve the changes after the final reading.

RJ will circulate the changes to the Board to approve.

JHa explains that the dates for the next meeting have already been decided.

REDACTED. See additional minutes.