**Minutes**

**Ethics and Environmental Sub-Committee 20/03/19**

Committee Members Present: Sophie Atherton (SAT), Fabrizio Contartese (FC), Eva Korczynski (EK), Karla Primc (KP)

Chair: Fabrizio Contartese

Apologies: Connor Bell (CB), Olivia McCue (OM), Tess Bonny (TB), Jess Scragg (JS), Ellie Reeves (ER)

Absent: Rob Klim (RK), Ian James (IJ), Lewis Martin (LM), Tilly Norton (TN)

Staff Support: Scott Arthur (SA) and Yasmine Haggar (YH)

1. Statements from the Chairperson and updates from members including actions from last meeting:

Committee members inquired as to what happened at the last meeting.

SA: Explained that the last meeting of the Sub-Committee was not quorate and only had one action assigned, which was to ER, who is absent. Additionally explained that much of the meeting was dedicated to discussing and preparing Go Green Week.

1. Officer Updates

SAT: Explained that she had been very busy lately with SU elections and other work so had little feedback at this point in time. Mentioned how she has held preliminary meetings with EK about next year. Pointed out that many of the Sub-Committee’s purchases are not dated and thus can be used (or reused) next year.

1. Go Green Week Review

SAT: Conceded that this year’s week did not go as well as hoped. However, did indicate that there are big plans in the works for next year.

1. E&E Competition (Societies or Individuals)

FC: Explained that this would take the form of a competition to organise an event to raise awareness for a particular cause. He thought it a good idea for the Sub-Committee to provide funds for this.

SAT: Explained that if this was organised by an individual society then they should apply to the societies grant. Highlighted that the Sub-Committee should only fund this if it is organised by multiple societies.

EK: Queried how much money was left in the society fund.

SAT: Explained that we had £2000 at the beginning of the year, and that we have approximately £850 of that left.\*

FC: Asked whether we could look at arranging an event with 4 or 5 societies competing, with the idea being that the budget is used to support them. Floated the idea of creating a proposition for the event in the next few weeks that can be distributed in order to get more submissions.

EK: Mentioned that she was aware that CB had such a mailing list that could be used for this purpose.

KP: Championed period poverty as a campaign to support, and was willing to push for a funding request to facilitate this support.

SAT: Mentioned that some menstrual cups are still in the office from a previous campaign and could be used in this campaign. Mentioned that the cheer team supported a period poverty campaign recently too, so they could potentially help out.

FC: Explained the call out for ideas could be done through Facebook.

SAT: Queried the particular nature of this event, and wondered what the purpose of it was. Explained the ‘mooncup Monday’ campaign that was run a few years ago, and that something of that nature would be easy to organise. Additionally explained the ‘sexperience’ campaign and that something along those lines could also be done, in collaboration with external groups.\*\*

EK: Mentioned the need for a framework to run this event on.

SAT: Floated the idea of doing an event in the hive from 12-4PM and then doing a fundraising event in the LCR.

EK: Queried whether a school outreach event could be done at the same time as this.

KP: Commented that raising awareness is very much the place to start, mentioned using a petition to do this.

FC: Championed the role of TedX Society, and asked what they could do to support this.

KP: Mentioned inviting Amika George to do a talk or outreach event.

EK: Mentioned the idea of the bookshelf upstairs in the hive being turned into a ‘green bookshelf’ with literature relevant to environmental issues.

SAT: Said that a request of say £50 would be sufficient for this purpose, and would happily support this.

Committee agreed that the 26th of April is a sensible cut-off date for suggestions.

FC: Asked whether this should be first come, first served or whether it should be based on the merits of the event.

EK: Argued that it being first come, first served is risky as it could potentially be abused.

FC: Replied that this is the issue with setting the deadline so far away, asserted that it doesn’t need to be that far in the future.

EK: Made the point that the more time people had to submit the suggestions the better.

SAT: Outlined the event; giving the society as stall in the Hive or LCR, giving them x amount of funding and the assistance needed to facilitate this event. Argued that 4 weeks is an appropriately long period of time for people to come up with suggestions.

KP: Reasserted that a petition is a good idea, and floated the idea that for every x amount of signatures we donate y amount of things.

SAT: Mentioned that we should consider allowing £50-£100 worth of funding for each event

EK: Argued that we should allow £50-£150 worth of funding instead.

\*Action: SAT to acquire a list of thing that the Sub-Committee has spent money on.

\*\*Action: SAT and YH to liaise with one another to draft the callout for ideas, and for the organising of the event

1. Reminder about Sub-Committee Elections

SAT: Explained when these elections open, and when they close. Nominations open on the 22nd of March, close on the 30th of April, voting is from the 6th to the 9th of May.

Committee members were reminded to nominate themselves if they so wished.

1. Any Other Business

SAT: Mentioned the allotments and the role they are going to play going forward.

EK: Discussed the long term plans for these allotments, and hoped that they would expand in the future.

1. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting

SA and YH to liaise in regard to this.