

Minutes

Subject:	Minutes of the UEASU Trustee Board 17 December 19
Produced by:	Tony Moore
To:	Board
Action:	To approve
Status:	For publication
Paper:	TB 1018
Purpose:	Record of Decision Making

Present: A Perez (ALP) (Full Time Officer Trustee elect), A Trew (AT) (Full Time Officer Trustee), M Marko (MM) (Full Time Officer Trustee), S Atherton (SAT) (Full Time Officer Trustee), K Watchorn (KW) (External Trustee), M Jopp (MJ) (External Trustee), J Clayton (JC) (External Trustee), C Flanagan (CF) (Student Trustee), S Chan (SC) (Student Trustee)

Present via conference phone: F Fay (FF) (External Trustee), D Smith (DS) (External Trustee)

Chair: C Perry (Full Time Officer Trustee)

In attendance: A Moore (AM) (Clerk to the Board), T Cave (Head of Finance) (TCA), T Cunningham (TCU) (CEO), C Wilson (HR Director), J Joyce (JJ) (CCW Auditor)

Apologies: K Roszkowska (KR) (Student Trustee), E Moxon (EM) (Part Time Officer Trustee), B Gibbins (BG) (External Trustee), A Khan Part Time Officer Trustee)

Key Decisions/deliberations:

- *Received draft Audit Report*
- *Discussed the University's funding of the Union*
- *Voted to reject a Union Council policy that would ban the sale of beef products and voted to reject an amendment to the policy that would have raised the price of beef in Union outlets whilst reducing the price of alternative products*

Action Points

- Finance Committee to look at external independent sampling of journals (TCA)
- ALP and FF appointed to Risk Committee (TM)

- Bi-annual review of governance to be included in Board Cycle of Business (TM)
- Minor changes to the map of the building in the Schedule of Delegation to be made and circulated. CEO to look at (TCU)
- Risk Committee to audit risk inherent from position of publisher of Concrete (CP)
- Letter to University from Board on financial position of the Union to be drafted: letter to state that, if funding is not increased, services to students will need to be cut (MJ/CP)
- Organisation Plan update to be re-circulated (TCU)
- Final version of Health and Safety Policy and Safeguarding Policy to be circulated to Board for approval (TCU)
- Risk Management Policy – formula to be applied to matrix and new draft circulated (TCU)

TB991 Audit Report

TCA advised that the Annual Accounts and Annual Report would not be signed off at the current meeting: after some minor revisions, these would go to Finance Committee for approval.

TCA noted one change from the accounts given to the Board's September meeting: with reconciliations, there was a difference of £12k from the profit and loss figure previously reported.

JJ advised that the key figure for Trustees, as to the statutory accounts, was a deficit of £21K.

JJ noted that they were required to highlight that this was as yet a draft report, as there were some minor changes consequent on information to be reported, but that the auditors did not expect any substantive change to their assessment.

JJ characterised the findings as a clean audit with only minor adjustments requested.

JJ thanked the Finance team for their hard work in provision of information to the auditors.

JC noted it was standard practice in many organisations for an audit committee to meet with the auditors without a staff presence.

The Board discussed the possibility of Finance Committee becoming the forum where the audit should be discussed.

TCU advised that, historically, the audit had been considered by the full Board and this ensured the greatest level of transparency as well as the participation of all the External Trustees.

JJ noted the following items in the report:

- Fraud risk areas: recognition of income and management override of controls

- £83K of aged debts (though management had assured the auditors that these were recoverable): a need for regular review of aged debt

ALP asked as to the identity of the debtors and the reasons for non-payment.

TCA advised that they did not have the full list to hand but a major issue stemmed from the transfer of tickets from ABC and this was currently the subject of ongoing discussions as to recovery.

- The large part that the legacy pension liabilities played in the balance sheet and the consequent major impact of any assumptions as to changes in the liabilities
- A legacy issue of missing HR documents which was currently being addressed

CW advised that progress had been made on Right to Work where the Union was completely compliant: ongoing work focused on redrafting and issuing of new contracts to staff.

- Non-material discrepancy found in the intercompany balances
- Fixed assets being written off to profit and loss once the Union had reached its capital budget and this did not appear to meet accounting standards: either an item was capital and was listed in the balance sheet or was revenue and should be treated as such

TCA advised there were some items where it was unclear whether they were to be treated as capex or within departmental spending; TCA advised that the level of expenditure was typically at a buying a new laptop level rather than big-ticket items being charged to departmental expenses.

TCU advised that a solution would be to establish a central capex account that departments could draw from.

- Cash variances: JJ noted that Union policies were not being adhered to consistently as variances were not always followed up; JJ believed this might be a training issue or it might mean that the variance to be reported was unrealistically low

JC wondered whether the Union tracked patterns of variance.

TCA advised that, at present, it did not but tracking could be introduced.

TCU advised that investigation of variance had been done well in the Shop but the failure had been in Bars and management were working on this: TCU noted that they would check the numbers across departments.

- Journals controls: JJ advised that CCW would talk to other SUs to find out how they managed journals and feedback to the Union and attempt to move more of the accounting from journals to a sales ledger

JC wondered whether there was any independent sampling of journals outside of the annual audit.

TCA advised that there were problems in being able to extract meaningful samples but this could be something that management could discuss with the system provider.

JJ advised, if the Union could extract from the system a full list of its journals, independent sampling would be good step forward.

JC requested it be made an action that a full list of journals be sought from the service provider and be independently, periodically reviewed.

*MJ asked that this be considered by Finance Committee when it received the final version of the Audit Report. **AP***

- Stock recording: JJ recommended further staff training in order to make the most of the benefits of the perpetual stock system

TCU advised that for Retail there were four internal stocktakes whilst the Bars used an external stocktaker. TCU noted that, for Bars, there was a new stocktaking provider in place and the intention was to obtain a system from them which would be operated by student staff and audited regularly by the external provider.

ALP noted they had been informed that some items had multiple stockcodes which was problematic.

TCU advised that the problem arose when items were supplied at a discount or as part of a multi-deal and management were working on the issue. TCU noted a complication was that the Shop did not use the supplier, Spar's back-end system and tills: it used the Fidelity system to align with the Bars and the Waterfront.

JJ highlighted progress as to the Auditors' prior year recommendations. JJ noted, however, that they would encourage year-end third-party supplier reconciliation as it would prevent incidents such as the one picked up by the audit when the same invoice went to both SUS and the Waterfront.

JJ noted there were no adjusted items of any significance.

JJ noted that the rest of the Report itemised and gave context to risk and, also, regulatory guidance.

TCU advised that great progress had been made as to financial procedures and reporting over the last three year. TCU advised that the Finance Team was a somewhat lean machine and if the Board thought they would wish for an enhanced Finance capacity this was something they might revisit at the Spring Meeting.

There were no further comments.

ADMINISTRATION

TB992 Membership and Statements from the Chair

Chair noted the appointment of Afia Khan as Part-Time Officer Trustee.

Chair noted apologies from B Gibbins, K Roszkowska, E Moxon, and Afia Khan.

On membership, MM noted there was a vacancy on the Board for a PG Student Trustee and wondered what was being done as to recruitment.

SA reported they had spoken to staff about advertising the vacancy and organising an election.

TB993 Register of Interests

Chair noted the declaration from A Khan: there were no new declarations.

TB994 Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 September were agreed.

TB995 Action Log and Matters Arising

Chair noted completed action points.

SA reported that the amendment to the articles to clarify the legal position of the Education Officers had been drafted: there were some tweaks to be made then it would be submitted to Union Council.

As to possible outside expertise to be added to the Risk Committee, TCU noted they had contacted Aviva and was awaiting a reply.

Chair noted they had finalised the CEO KPIs with FF and would circulate these to Trustees.

MM noted they had requested an action on aligning the Union's strategic objectives with its stated values and this had not been logged.

TCU advised that SMT had been waiting on national political developments and the outcome of the talks with the University on sustainable finance before undertaking a major strategic revision: preparatory discussion on a new strategic framework would take part at the Spring Board and alignment with the Union's values would form a key part of the discussions.

TB996 Sub-Committee Minutes

MM reported, as Chair of the Appointments and HR Committee, that the Committee had had a quorate meeting after a series of meetings which had not made quorum. MM noted that the Committee would be working to align the Schedule of Delegation with the Bye-Laws' requirements and to clarify its apparent overlap with EDICt and would be reviewing the process for recruitment of Student Trustees. MM noted that the Committee had clarified that External Trustees whose term of office would be ending in the current academic year had indicated that they would seek election for a further term.

Chair reported the Risk Committee had met for the first time and had reviewed the Risk Register. FF agreed to take the External Trustee role on the Committee. ALP asked to be added to the membership of the Committee. **AP**

TB996i Schedule of Delegation

TCU advised that the Schedule delineated the responsibilities for decision making throughout the organisation. TCU advised that there were no material changes from the previous year.

JC noted puzzlement as to why responsibility for the appointment of senior managers was with the Board but responsibility for recruitment of the CEO sat with a sub-committee.

TCU advised that responsibility for the design of the initial recruitment process was given to the AHRC in the Bye-Laws but that the final appointment was made by the Board.

JC thought that the common cause of major problems experienced by charities was defects in governance and noted they could not see in the Schedule which body had responsibility for periodic review of governance.

TM advised that responsibility for governance review lay with the Board.

Chair requested that a bi-annual review of governance be added to the Board's Cycle of Business. **AP**

MM believed it unclear as where the boundary lay for responsibility for operational and strategic oversight of HR between Management Committee and AHRC.

SA noted the reason why staffing policies had been coming to Management Committee had been because AHRC had not been functioning for a considerable period of time; SA suggested that, once AHRC was functioning again, these would revert to AHRC.

ALP noted that Management Committee had been delegated the power to approve urgent spending to £20K subject to the approval of the Chair of Finance Committee; ALP wondered what would happen if the FC Chair approved an item and the majority of Management Committee rejected it.

TCU advised that this would be a constitutional issue that would be resolved by the Board.

MM noted that there had been some changes to use of rooms since the building plan had been made for the Graduate Centre and these needed to be included in the Schedule.

TCU advised that they would make the changes to the building plan and circulate for approval and research the interface for HR responsibilities for Management Committee and AHRC. **AP**

There were no further comments.

The Board approved the Schedule of Delegation for 2019-20 subject to the above changes.

PERFORMANCE

TB997 Chief Executive Report

TCU drew attention to the written report.

TCU updated the report noting that an offer would be made to one of the candidates for the Assistant Director of Charitable Services post. TCU noted that none of the candidates had proved suitable for appointment to the Assistant Director of Venues post but that one of the candidates might have a lot to offer in a business development role and management would be looking into the possibility of creating a new, self-funding role. TCU advised that the AD Venues post would be re-advertised in January and, if no suitable candidate was found, management would look at the possibility of engaging external expertise. TCU reported that a new Head of Marketing, Communications and Insight had been appointed.

On risk and compliance, TCU reported that named staff members had been assigned responsibility for each item in the updated Risk Register.

TCU noted that a new item had been added to the Register: reputational risk posed by articles published in Concrete. TCU advised that the reactions to a recent article on the multi-agency mental health task force had highlighted the risk.

JC wondered if the Board had at any time scrutinised the arrangements with Concrete to ensure that the Union was adequately protected.

TCU advised that the arrangements for pre-publication scrutiny were robust but that the arrangements in their entirety might be audited by the Risk Committee.

ALP noted that they, as Activities and Opportunities Officer, were the publisher and had an ultimate veto for any item in the print publication; if there was anything questionable in an article, they would seek legal advice.

JC noted that Concrete had recently published an article that could have damaged individuals and damaged student mental health.

TCU agreed but advised that the piece had met all regulatory compliance and there had been no grounds to prevent publication.

JC wondered if as a result of the article it could be shown that a student had been directly harmed it would be difficult to argue that it was nothing to do with the Union.

TCU advised that, in regulatory terms, this was, indeed, the case.

JC wondered whether the Board had had legal advice that Trustees would have no liability in such cases.

ALP believed it had not. ALP emphasised the need to respect the editorial independence of Concrete.

TCU advised that the Union could not stop Concrete publishing opinions about campus matters. TCU advised that, if a student took an action after reading an article, it would be hard to prove a direct, causal link to the article.

JC thought this would not rule out a civil action based on the balance of probabilities with possibly severe consequences for the Union.

Chair noted JC's concerns and asked that an audit of the risk to the Union posed by articles in Concrete be audited by the Risk Committee. **AP**

TCU reported that management had identified an inherent risk in the queuing system used for gigs and had added this to the Register. The Union was using its external consultants to re-work the system and to continually assess its workings and had raised the matter with University Estates. TCU noted they would be working with the Head of Estates on short-term fixes but that, ultimately, it would need to be addressed by a project group looking at changing the fabric of the building, lighting and landscaping.

MJ wondered whether the problem had been exacerbated by variably priced staggered entry.

TCU noted management had moved away from staggered entry and had instituted a mirrored, double lane system but given the landscape and road access issues, there would still be an inherent risk despite the mitigating measures the Union had put in place.

JC wondered if there were to be an accident whether it would be the University's or the Union's liability.

TCU advised that, ultimately, it would be the University's as the Union had notified it of the inherent risk involved in operation of the current system which the Union managed on the University's property. TCU noted, however, that as the Union provided the fencing and the staff there was some element of shared liability.

CF wondered as to why the Union had moved away from staggered entry.

TCU advised that students had not liked the staggered system and management had implemented new processes to deal with the peak entry flows in as safe a manner as possible given the landscape problems.

TCU noted another recent update to the Register stemmed from the HMRC's challenge to SU's exemption on catering sales when they involved selling from Bars. TCA advised that if the HMRC's challenge was upheld and applied to the Union, the Union would be liable for VAT on pizza sales since it had applied for the exemption and this, with interest and assuming no penalties were imposed, would amount to around £90K. TCA noted, without VAT exemption, pizza sales would no longer be profitable. In response to JC, TCA noted that there was the

possibility of joining other SUs in collective funding for a judicial review but this would be a costly and uncertain process.

TCU reported, on UCU strike action, that it looked likely that there would be strike action over the exam period and previous experience had shown that when their graduation was delayed students' support for academics' strike action tended to fall away. TCU would update the Board on any developments.

TCU advised, on sustainable finance, that ALP, the Chair of Finance Committee, had met with the University's Chief Resource Officer to discuss the underfunding of the Union compared to comparator institutions. TCU noted there would be a possibility that the University would increase the Block Grant but, unless it addressed the cost of maintenance of the building and capex to maintain services, long-term financial sustainability would still be in doubt.

MJ noted that the Chief Resource Officer would be happy for the Board to write to the University's Executive Team to express their concerns as the current funding model and to note that if there were to be no change to the model the Board would have to consider changing the level of service provision to students.

*The Board asked MJ to draft a letter to the University's Executive Team – the draft will be circulated to Trustees for comment. **AP***

TCU advised that this was the last year when the Board had been asked to approve an 'as is' budget; if there were no change to funding, the Spring Board would need to look at which areas of membership services to cut or retain.

TCU advised, on licensed trade, that after the events in the spring, an external consultant had been brought in and they had conducted a thorough review of risk and legal compliance which would continue to be audited.

TCU noted that the Board should be aware of two recent incidents. The previous Wednesday morning, after attending the Tuesday LCR, a student allegedly attacked another student just off campus and inflicted a serious knife wound: the injured student was currently in a stable condition. TCU noted the alleged assailant had been arrested and bailed to live at their home address. TCU reported an incident on the previous Saturday, where students had attended an LCR event, two groups of students became involved in a fracas in Earlham Park where, allegedly, a knife was produced. TCU noted that knife crime was a new development on campus and that security and search procedures had been heightened at the LCR. TCU advised that the Union would be working with the police and the University as well as consulting youth charities on how to address the issue.

In response to a question from ALP, TCU noted that the alleged assailant would be dealt with firstly by the police, then by the University, and, if appropriate action had not been taken, the Union would then consider dealing with the matter under its Code of Conduct.

ALP asked it be minuted that there had been an increase in cases of harassment on campus, many of which, students had not reported to the University.

MM asked, in reference to the CEO's written report, for clarification which set of values had been used as the basis for the Organisational Plan.

TCU advised that these were taken from those set out in the Articles and the strategic interpretation of them agreed at the Strategic Development Weekend in April 2019.

MM asked that in its conversations with the University on finance the Union take a position that aligned with the University's own strategic plan.

There were no further comments.

TB998 Organisational Plan 19-20 Update

Two Trustees noted difficulties accessing the updates to the Plan. Chair noted they would recirculate the updated Plan to Trustees. **AP**

There were no further comments.

TB999 Senior Management Team Papers

Noted without comment.

TB1000 Annual External Speakers Review

TCU advised that there had been no incidents in the previous twelve months of concern to the Board.

The Board noted receipt of the Review without comment.

COMMERCIAL AND TRADING

TB1002 Development and Oversight Board Minutes

Noted without comment.

TB1003 Social Enterprise Report

TCU highlighted:

- Bars not performing as expected
- Decline in Tuesday nights' attendance
- Strong performance of the live music programme
- Spend per head slightly up on Club Nights but overall attendance down
- Upward trend of students bringing own daytime food – more demand for hot water and microwave facilities
- Retail performing well
- Unio plateaued due to capacity constraints

TCU noted that management would be working to grow the Tuesday nights and look at new Bars pricing models in January. TCU noted that staff had been looking at students' spending habits and the music offer.

JC wondered whether the current level of underperformance against budget was something the Board should be worried about.

TCA advised that, if it carried on for the rest of the year, the answer would be yes as it would empty the surplus reserves which were not in the Reserves Policy to be used to prop up a faltering commercial performance.

JC believed it necessary to deal with the underperformance and noted being uncertain as to whether they had heard a convincing plan to address the problem.

TCA cautioned that the figures were for only roughly six weeks of trading and it might be premature to jump to conclusions for the entire year as the recent November figures had shown a performance around budget. TCA advised that the picture would be clearer in time for the March Board when the half-year forecast would be available and the University's intentions as to funding would be known.

MM wondered whether the NUSSL drinks deal was currently being looked at.

TCU advised that this would be a matter for an incoming Assistant Director of Venues to look at as a priority.

There were no further comments.

FINANCE & LEGAL

TB1004 First Quarter Management Accounts

TCA reiterated TCU's concerns about Bars and noted Bars huge impact on the figures as Bars contributed over half the overall revenues.

SA wondered whether there had been any positive financial impact from the change away from staggered entrance prices.

TCA noted that they did not have any figures as yet.

ALP noted there would be and that, if a Club Night sold out, there would be £800 extra revenue.

MM believed the Union should not focus entirely on revenue generation and believed that the Union's charitable values should inform the setting of prices in the Bars and Shops; MM thought that they should be factored in to the Union's proposal to the University on sustainable finances.

TCA advised that one of the factors influencing the Union's position in the discussions with the University was that revenue generation was falling away as

the negotiations were taking place and it was difficult to judge what the 'right' level of performance should be to represent to the University.

JC thought the University would need to determine whether the Union's present position was due to what might be deemed to be its inefficient management of its assets or whether it was due changes in student behaviour and other extraneous factors.

TCA noted the difficulties of gathering hard evidence as to extraneous factors.

TCU advised the setting of prices in the Shop was conditioned by the fact that it was a convenience store and not a chain supermarket with bulk buying power and the ability to slash prices. TCU advised that it was an option for the Board to slash Shop prices in the hope of increasing sales and to give students cheaper prices but for a convenience store it was highly unlikely that sales would increase dramatically enough to compensate for the lower prices.

TCU advised, as to the Union's efficiency, that work done three years before had shown that the Union had a conversion ratio of turning revenue into charitable spend of 18%: higher than that of other SUs.

MM clarified that they believed the pricing level was about right from a business perspective but MM was concerned about student perceptions. MM thought that a number of students believed the Union's commercial services 'ripped them off' and this affected their attitude to the Union's functioning as a charity.

MM agreed to the Chair's suggestion that they attend Finance Committee to have a wider discussion on the issue of pricing to feedforward to the Strategy Development Weekend.

There were no further comments.

STRATEGY/POLICY

TB1005 Health and Safety Policy and Safeguarding Policy

TCU noted that the Safeguarding Policy had been agreed with the trade union at the Joint Negotiation and Consultation Committee (JCNC). TCU noted that some changes to the HS Policy had been asked for by SMT, concerning the role of the HS Committee Chair; the new version would then go to JCNC.

JC noted the policies were not included in the agenda papers: the item was marked 'verbal updated'.

TCU apologised and advised that the policies would be circulated to Trustees after the meeting.

CP noted they would, as Chair's action, circulate the policies for approval. **AP**

There were no further comments.

RISK

TB1006 Risk Management Policy

TCU advised that the policy was the one approved at June Board merged with the policy approved at September Board.

Received without comment.

TB1007 Risk Register

TCU advised that updates had been dealt with earlier in the CEO Report.

JC noted that the risk evaluation matrix formula set out in the Risk Management Policy had not been used in the RAG rating for the Register; JC asked that this be actioned.

Chair asked that the required changes be made and circulated to Trustees. **AP**

Received without further comment.

TB1008 Updates on Risk Audit Report

TCU advised that the issues raised in the report were the subject of discussion at SMT meetings and that any issues unresolved by the time of the Spring Board would be integrated into the Risk Register or organisational plan.

Noted without comment.

TB1009 Legal Compliance Checklist

TCU advised that the Checklist had been designed after work in the summer involving all departments to identify legal compliance requirements in every area of the Union's activities: the Checklist identified individual expertise and assigned compliance responsibilities.

Received without comment.

TB1010 GDPR Update

TCU advised that the Union had been hoping to work with another SU that could have provided expert advice on how to audit compliance but the other SU had pulled out: management would be looking at how to conduct an internal audit using the Union's resources.

Noted without comment.

SUNDRIES

TB1011 Staffing (Closed session)

For this item, all staff, excepting the Clerk, left the meeting.

CEO KPIs

The Board noted the updated KPIs without comment.

Staff returned to the meeting.

TB1012 Key Decisions of Union Council

SA noted that the Board had asked, in the spring of 2019, for the Union to conduct a democracy review. SA noted that they had been working with an external consultant to conduct the review. SA noted that a draft report had been completed with two democratic models to put to the membership: Model A a grassroots approach and Model B a zonal approach. SA noted that there was a recommendation for an officer role review which SA was currently conducting.

Chair noted that the draft Report had been circulated separately from the agenda papers and that any comments Trustees wished to make should be made to the Chair who would pass them on to SA.

JC thought that the democratic structure should be a matter for the democratic arm. JC believed that any ramifications for the Board's powers or risks posed to the Board by the adoption of either Model had not been addressed in the Report.

TCU advised that there were no identifiable risks for the Board in either Model: there was no change to the balance of power within the Union: if any implications were to be identified these would be resolved by the democratic arm on the advice of Union staff.

SA noted there had been three Union Council meetings so far in the current academic year.

SA reported that one resolution passed by Union Council, Beef with Beef, had financial implications for the Union and needed to be considered by the Board.

SA noted that a whole raft of policies were to be considered for policy lapse by Union Council in the spring semester and any decisions taken would be reported to Spring Board.

JC noted as to the Beef resolution it was unclear what the financial implications for the Union would be.

TCU advised that if the Union were to end sales of beef and customers did not switch to alternative products the cost to the Union would be around £25K a year in lost profit.

TCU noted that the amended policy stipulated lowering the price of alternative products would mean wiping out any profit on the alternative products: TCU advised that this would mean a loss of around £20K in profit.

TCU advised, in response to questions from JC and ALP that it was an option, under the amended pol for the Union to simply increase the price of beef. TCU noted a complicating factor was that with the wide publicity over Council's

decision there had been a falling away of beef sales as students had gained the impression that the Union no longer sold beef.

MJ wondered whether stopping all beef products such as beef sandwiches in the meal deal was within the Union's gift.

TCU advised that the Union's arrangements with its suppliers were designed to include the possibility that some products might be withdrawn from sale due to policy decisions by Union Council so it would be within the Union's gift.

FF wondered as to the University's selling of beef products.

SA confirmed that the University would continue to sell beef products but that one of the strands of the policy was to lobby the University to end their sale.

MJ wondered whether Union Council had been given any financial modelling of the direct cost to the Union: MJ thought it would be worthwhile to send the policy back to Council with the modelling.

SA noted that they had made Union Council aware of the financial implications to the Union during the debate on the resolution and had asked for a postponement until January so that a full costing could be considered but that Council had rejected the request.

TCU advised that the Board should, in the light of Council's rejection of SA's request for a delay until a full costing could be produced, take a view rather than return the matter to Council. TCU advised that the Board should take a cautious view as to Union Council's ability to directly set prices in the commercial services. TCU advised that if the Board approved this particular policy it would set a precedent that Council had the power to set the price of any product, including drink prices, sold by the Union.

MJ thought the matter to be a sensitive political issue on campus and asked for the FTO Trustees' views.

SA noted they had seconded the original resolution to remove the sale of beef products and had received a lot of political criticism. SA noted they had been clear to Councillors that, because of the financial cost and the implications of council setting prices in the Shop, the matter would be decided by Board. SA thought that there were other ways of achieving the aims of reducing beef consumption on campus that could be looked at and there also the possibility of sending the question to a referendum.

AT agreed with SA as to promotion of alternatives to beef. SA characterised their own stance as neutral but disappointed that the beef controversy had taken time and energy away from working on more pressing issues facing students.

ALP believed Board should reject both the original policy and the amendment.

MM noted the Board was empowered to reject a policy if it posed a serious financial risk to the Union; MM believed that the sum of £20K could not be viewed as constituting a serious financial risk.

TCU updated the meeting with the figures in a paper that had gone to Management Committee when the original policy was passed and advised, with the sales from the Bakery included, the loss in sales computed from the previous year would be £47.5K.

KW believed that if the Board were making the decision on the principle as to the power to make decisions on product prices then the financial modelling did not come into play.

FF noted concern as to setting a precedent.

TCU advised that the Board would be making a decision on principle in considering the price-setting amendment and on financial risk when considering the original policy.

JC noted that the starting point for Board when it made decisions on policy was to enable the democratic decisions made by students. JC asked that if the Board decided to reject the policy and/or amendment that it be fed back to Council that the Board fully shared its commitment to sustainability and the Union would be working toward a sustainable future.

Chair ruled that the matter would be decided by a vote.

The Board voted to reject the amended Union Council resolution with MM voting to accept and AT abstaining.

The Board voted to reject the original Union Council resolution with three members abstaining.

TB1013 Any Other Business

FTO Trustees left the meeting for a closed briefing by the CEO to the rest of the Board.

TB1014 Time, date and place of next meeting

3 pm, Saturday 28 March 2019

TB1015 Revised Cycle of Business

Noted without comment.