

Minutes of the **EUSA Trustee Board Meeting** held on
Wednesday 27th January 2016 in the Dining Room, Teviot

Present
Jonny Ross-Tatam (JRT) – President (Chair)
Imogen Wilson (IW) – VPAA – Dept 1:30pm
Urte Macikene (UM) – VPS – Dept 4:25pm
Andy Peel (AP) – VPSA
Greg Lane (GL) – Student Trustee
Harriet Protheroe-Davies (HPD) – Student Trustee
Alec Edgecliffe-Johnson (AEJ) – Student Trustee – Dept 2:15pm and returned 3:05pm
Juliana Fentress (JF) – Student Trustee
Nathaniel Brimmer-Beller (NBB) – Student Trustee
Stewart Goldberg (SG) – External Trustee
Yvonne Stewart (YS) – External Trustee

In Attendance
Stephen Hubbard (SH) – CEO
Sarah Purves (SP) – Director of Membership Support and Development
Euan MacLean (EM) – Finance Director
Zoi Mazluga (ZM) – Executive Assistant
Emma Robertson-Werner (ERW) – Marketing Manager – Arr 3pm and dept 3:45pm
Caroline Simpson (CS) – Senior Planner of Whitespace – Arr 3pm and dept 3:45pm

Apologies
Douglas Blackstock (DB) – External Trustee

		Action
1.	<p>Welcome</p> <p>JRT opened the meeting at 1:06pm and noted apologies from DB. JRT further noted IW will be leaving at 1:30pm and AEJ will be leaving at 2:15pm returning at approximately 3pm. JRT added we will have a presentation from ERW, the EUSA Marketing Manager, and CS of Whitespace (agenda item 5) after the access break at 3pm.</p> <p>JRT informed there has been an agenda swap since the papers were circulated and consequently the Democracy Review (paper E) has been moved up to be first on the agenda so that all student trustees are able to be involved in that discussion.</p> <p>JRT asked if anyone had AOB of which none was noted.</p>	
2.	<p>Standing Business</p> <p>2.1 Conflict of Interest None declared.</p>	
3.	<p>3.1 Minutes from Previous Meeting</p> <p>JRT advised that all members of the Trustee Board (TB) approved the previous minutes by</p>	

t: 0131 650 2656 | e: reception@eusa.ed.ac.uk | w: www.eusa.ed.ac.uk

	<p>electronic business and they were uploaded to EUSA website on the 14th December 2015.</p>	
	<p>3.2 Matters Arising: JRT advised the following matters arising were all circulated prior to this meeting or are covered elsewhere in the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2.1 - SH to set up task group re the management of TB business – Circulated 20th January 2016 • 3.2.2 - SH to send the key points from the period review taking place in December – Circulated 20th January 2016 • 3.2.3 - SH to send the research that went into our strategic plan as per JRT’s request – Circulated 20th January 2016 • 3.2.4 - IW to send the recommendations from the enhancement review panel – IW to update • 3.2.5 - EM to bring the risk register to the next TB meeting – Covered in agenda item 11 	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Democracy Review Update – SP <u>4.1 Key Outcomes</u> SP presented the democracy review paper E noting the themes that emerged and the proposals put forward. An additional paper providing a summary of the operation of Student Council was circulated (drawn up post a Student Council Workshop on the 21st January 2016).</p> <p>SP informed that the survey was live for 3 weeks with over 1800 students engaging with it, and 1377 complete responses. The study focused on 3 areas; the role of the sabbatical officers, student representation and EUSA decision making. SP then ran through a presentation highlighting key results.</p> <p>SP summarised the main proposals put forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in the number of sabbatical roles from 4-5 to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - President - Vice President Activities and Services (VPAS) - Vice President Community (VPC) - Vice President Education (VPE) - Vice President Welfare (VPW) • A revised set of sabbatical roles and remits • The possibility of students running for a 2nd sabbatical term of office • Retention of Student Council, but with a revised membership, and new procedures • Introduction of a new way for policy issues to be referred to the membership through cross-campus ballot • The introduction of some substantial, paid representative roles, to enable us to strengthen representation in relation to 2 key areas identified by students and by EUSA: student identity/liberation, and academic representation • Revised membership of the Trustee Board <p>JRT opened the matter for discussion.</p> <p><u>4.2 Sabbatical Officers/Student Trustees/Reps</u> SG highlighted that as students associate socialising as a primary function of EUSA having a sabbatical interested in the trade element of what EUSA seems important therefore the lack of emphasis on commercial business is a concern. UM commented that at least half of her time is spent on services and that there was a discussion if services should be present which the</p>	

<p>sabbaticals agreed to keep. SH added that the NUS believe there should be stronger overview rather than side all with one sabbatical i.e. with reps on the Trading Committee and the Trustees, however the remit for the VPAS would address this along with buildings, room use etc.</p> <p>HPD queried why we are looking to pay for more part-time reps when EUSA is not in best financial state, particularly with the NLW implementation coming up in April. SP responded that these roles would be different from other rep roles and they would be expected to perform other duties.</p> <p>YS noted that there are only certain posts you can advertise specifically for ('excepted posts') to which SH advised we are aware of this and there would need to be some further reflection on just how any payment was handled.</p> <p>GL queried the current sabbatical workload and how they view the proposed system – AP advised he should be spending 50% of his time dedicated to activities and the other 50% dedicated to welfare but finds this division of workload difficult as welfare takes up around 80% of his time. AP acknowledged activities is a huge opportunity to engage with students and observed that we miss out on this therefore the proposed new system seems logical. UM added there is no explicate place for community and estates so the VPS has taken this on. GL noted his concern that services/activities seems too big a remit.</p> <p>NBB queried the liberation group representation homogenising one person's view. AP responded by highlighting that the results showed from the students' perspective the priority was equality.</p> <p>HPD raised concern over the proposal to appoint trustees instead of electing them, which NBB seconded. YS emphasised the importance of enhancing the student body and how representative are the current sabbaticals/trustees and if there is a large gap that requires addressing. SH noted that the NUS proposition on this was the vast majority of students don't want to run for election furthermore, the student trustee role is more about competency coupled with having a skill set with an interest in governance/legal/financial issues. AEJ queried if there is any data on the respondents who took the survey – SP advised will circulate this. GL added there is no doubt many students who would do a great job sitting on the TB do not want to run for election.</p> <p>SG requested opinions from the sabbaticals regarding the proposal to be able to run for a second term as historically the University used to be against this. JRT commented Edinburgh is an anomaly where this is not permitted and UM added that long term projects cannot be completed due to a 1 year term.</p> <p><u>4.3 Student Council</u></p> <p>A discussion ensued following AEJ's query regarding the 1.5 weight of an elected rep's vote vs ordinary student attendee's vote to which SH advised there was a robust start point and mathematical equation to which this was decided, but whilst robust it was too complex to understand, hence switch is the simpler 1.5 – which was a similar figure. GL raised concern that the motion would not affect students directly.</p> <p><u>4.4 Consensus</u></p> <p>JRT summarised the contentious issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether liberation reps should exist or not and if they should be paid or not (NBB) • Whether student trustees should be appointed or elected (HPD) • Elected reps having 1.5 weighted vote (HPD, JF) 	<p>SP</p>
---	-----------

	<p><i>All approved to go to referendum except NBB.</i></p> <p>SG advised best to headline the points in any referendum questions and YS added the need to simplify and make very clear this is to enhance representation.</p>	
	<p>-Access Break taken at 2:50pm. Meeting resumed at 3:06pm-</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>EUSA Rebrand Update – ERW & CS</p> <p>ERW presented the EUSA rebrand paper F and emphasised we are currently in the development phase of the project. CS then gave a presentation of the top line of the project to date noting findings show best to change the name of EUSA to follow the University’s example of ‘University of Edinburgh’ furthermore, extensive research showed people identify far better with ‘union’ than ‘association.’</p> <p>SH noted any decision to change the name would likely need to go to referendum as per the constitution. AP flagged Edinburgh University Student Union (EUSU) is the current name of our Sport’s Union.</p> <p>A discussion ensued around the changing the name noting there was a general consensus that it is not as important whether it is Edinburgh University or University of Edinburgh, but that union as opposed to association was preferred. UM raised the point that union is used far more in England, whereas association is used more in Scotland. CS responded that although that is true, people in Scotland still identify better with union than association, and the survey noted this was more so with young people who intended to attend University.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>National Living Wage (NLW) – SH</p> <p>SH presented the NLW paper G advising it is a combination of points raised from the previous TB meeting, the last 2 HR Subcommittees (HR SC) and the last Finance Subcommittee. Consequently we have arrived at 2 options A and B plus financial mitigation noting a new option of increasing trade.</p> <p>SH advised that the HR SC specified fixing a £30k grant request from the University and all options are based around this. SH added this was just to have a start point, but was based on estimated costs for University funded specific projects and services.</p> <p>SH advised we have built the following models from the ground up to create options noting there is a range of unknowns that could impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To pay the Voluntary Living Wage (£8.25) to all staff • Option A - To pay the National Living Wage (£7.20) to all ages and across (with uplifts) all grades • Option B - Pay all supervisory posts at a rate above the National Living Wage (£7.20 the first supervisory premium therefore being £7.37) regard of age. But the team member rate remains at £6.70 which is the over 21 years National Minimum wage which we pay to those under 21 also. Obviously those over 25 will get the uplift to £7.20 • The base ‘legal minimum’ cost- simply ensure those aged 25 and over are paid at least the minimum of £7.20 regardless of role or current rate. Do not apply this to anyone under age 25. 	

	<p>SG raised the point that all these options assume the status quo that there will be no change in commercial offering. SH responded that the SMT recommend to exercise caution and go with the lower option as implementation due in April 2016 until we can undertake more vigorous analysis.</p> <p>UM expressed view she (and other sabbatical officers) had started out with strong preference for Option A and had maintained this preference until recently, but had been significantly concerned with current trading figures in the last Finance Committee and variety of factors influencing this which we did not fully understand, therefore now agreed Option B was preferable in this wider context.</p> <p>HPD and other trustees also reflected this point that whilst option A was preferable the financial stability and sustainability of the organisation led to option B being the viable route currently.</p> <p>There was a reserved minute relating to specific staff terms and conditions.</p> <p>GL queried how easily we attract student staff to which SH advised this was currently not an issue, but may become so.</p> <p>It was clarified we can review the matter after a year but we can only go higher thereafter not lower.</p> <p>A discussion ensued around EUSA's reputation and YS highlighted a need to look at it as positively as possible with no one losing but many gaining from this.</p> <p>UM suggested bringing on Unison and it was noted that there was very little staff enthusiasm for Unison currently.</p> <p>The TB agreed that the general consensus is to go with option B with an articulation that we are going with this option with regret and have an aspiration to get to option A in the future *(which HPD champions). Communication and detail of this is to be delegated to the HR SC which will meet next week on the 3rd March 2016. SH added that the planning round application would reflect the idea of an ultimate aim for option A.</p>	
7.	<p>President's Report – JRT To be noted by electronic business offline as meeting closed.</p>	
8.	<p>CEO Report – SH To be noted by electronic business offline as meeting closed.</p>	
9.	<p>Director Reports</p>	
	<p>9.1 Director of Membership Support and Development – SP To be noted by electronic business offline as meeting closed.</p>	
	<p>9.2 Finance Director Report/Period 9 Financial Summary – EM To be noted by electronic business offline as meeting closed.</p>	

10.	Commercial Director Role Review Update – SH To be noted by electronic business offline as meeting closed.	
11.	Risk Management Update – EM To be noted by electronic business offline as meeting closed.	
12.	Subcommittees Update	
	12.1 HR Subcommittee, 9 th December 2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes – Paper I To be noted by electronic business offline as meeting closed. 12.2 Trading Committee, 16 th December 2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes – Paper J To be noted by electronic business offline as meeting closed. 12.3 Finance Subcommittee, 15 th January 2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes – Paper K To be noted by electronic business offline as meeting closed.	
13.	Legal & Risk Update – EM To be noted by electronic business offline as meeting closed.	
14.	AOB None.	
JRT expressed thanks to all for attending and apologised for overrunning. JRT closed the meeting at 4:30pm.		
The next meeting is scheduled to take place on Wednesday 30th March at 1pm in the Dining Room, Teviot.		