

**Societies, Sports & Opportunities Executive Minutes**

Date & time	5 <sup>th</sup> November 2020 – 17:30
Location	MS Teams
Attendance	<p>Lucy Brown (VP Societies &amp; Sport) – Chair            Kate Roberts (President)            James Shannon            Kayleigh Fryer            Olivia Stocks            Josh Miskin            Jodie Charman            Charlotte L. Wassell            Evie Skyrme            Afreen Shaikh            Chloe Williams</p> <p>Phill Dowler (Democracy Coordinator) – Secretary            Natalie Bates (Student Voice Manager)            Dan Curran (Deputy Head of Membership Support &amp; Engagement)            Megan Beddoe (Sports Clubs Coordinator)</p>
Apologies	James Giles

Item	Action	Responsible	Due
2.	Investigate whether student groups need to be categorised at all, or more accurately.	LB	28 <sup>th</sup> Jan
3.	Members to read through 2020 Vision document and identify points people are interested in and feed back to LB.	All	ASAP
7.	Feedback the lack of track and trace check-in with ALS	LB	ASAP
8.	Members to complete form if to be part of student group funding panel.	All	ASAP

Item	Notes	Action
1. Welcome	LB welcomes members and notes apologies.	
2. Officer Update	<p>LB takes paper as read and asks for input on key points throughout.</p> <p>How was your experience of student group training and how can we improve?</p> <p>There was general consensus that the training went well and if information wasn't there, it followed very quickly. It set the expectation that things will be changing throughout the year.</p>	

	<p>During the virtual fresher's fair, student groups were categorised based on historic processes. Are they still relevant or do we need to change them?</p> <p>KF suggests there should be a way for groups to reflect on the way they are categorised. For groups that have existed for longer, they may not even realise.</p> <p>OS suggests removing categories as they can be misleading and comes away from the ongoing work to encourage inclusion and diversity. The categories might be dividing people and putting students off joining. The idea is outdated.</p> <p>DC clarifies why they exist and the way they worked historically.</p> <p>JS admits while there is some merit, the categories are based on activity and interest which are too broad and don't reflect those within them.</p> <p>How was the communication regarding the fair?</p> <p>CLW suggests that there needed to be more time to prepare for it although there were a lot of leaning points and that is was a good alternative.</p> <p>ES added that there needed to be more ongoing information and communication. After the initial application, there were no updates that followed until the day the fair was launched. There were no opportunities to amend, or feed into how they'd like their information presented.</p> <p>KF adds that a run through or induction beforehand would have helped groups understand how the fair was going to work and their information would be communicated.</p> <p>On the point of the governance articles available on Freshdesk, members generally weren't aware there had been new articles made available although there was good guidance on making amendments to constitutions.</p>	<p>LB to Investigate whether student groups need to be categorised at all, or more accurately.</p>
<p>3. 2020 Vision</p>	<p>LB noted the paper as read before discussing individual points.</p> <p>There was general support for the Committee Support café ideas but concern was raised over limiting them to themes. KF notes that no one wants to admit they have issues so suggests SSO acts as conversation starters and that a rotor could be formed for various members to attend them.</p>	<p>Members to read through 2020 Vision document and identify points people are interested in and feed back to LB.</p>

	<p>CLW suggests that they can be used as a social networking opportunity rather than a space for problems. Support is often provided privately so having the chance to meet and connect with other committees is a good opportunity.</p> <p>When discussing recognition, JM suggests using social media to promote positive activity as it opens up to a wider group of followers.</p> <p>LB asks all members to read over the 2020 Vision document again and if there is interest in any of the points, to work directly with LB to progress them.</p>	
<p>4. VP Societies &amp; Sport Role</p>	<p>LB leads a discussion into the new role after the merge of the previous VP Societies &amp; Media, and VP Sport roles.</p> <p>When asked on what the new role means to students, there was concern that there would be too many groups to oversee and understand. But so far it is a success and there is a lot more unity between clubs and societies that wasn't there before.</p> <p>Discussing the expectations of the role, there is a demand for more visibility for what the VP is doing and for them to be the point of information. There is also the expectation for a support and social relationship between the VP role and committees.</p> <p>Looking at whether there should be regular drop-in opportunities or as needed meetings, the Executive agreed the ad hoc approach would be better.</p> <p>LB facilitated an activity that asked members to list their hopes and concerns for the role.</p> <p>Hopes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Committee Café's will provide more support</li> <li>- One point of communication will make things clearer, more unified and more collaborative</li> <li>- More opportunities for campaign work</li> <li>- More support for sponsorships</li> </ul> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The role might favour clubs/societies more than the other and create a bigger divide</li> <li>- The role might be too overwhelming and put people off taking on so much</li> <li>- COVID-19 eliminating all activities for the year</li> <li>- Not all committees or members understand the new role</li> <li>- Not enough time to understand the unique needs of each group</li> <li>- Less support having one role rather than two</li> </ul>	

5. Amendment to Byelaw L	DC provides an update on the amendment to Byelaw L. No comments were provided	
6. Online Ratifications	<p>DC runs through tabled document running through the key points of information including dormancy, ratifications and de-ratifications before opening up the discussion.</p> <p>DC clarifies after a question from JS, that all dormant and de-ratified groups will be kept public for interested.</p> <p>JM queries the new ratification process, removing the presentation part of the previous process and not getting the ability to engage with the proposed committee in a positive way. LB explains this process will allow groups to present in more creative ways, without the Executive feeling compelled to respond positively rather than constructively as the committee were present.</p> <p>The Executive <b>agree</b> the new processes.</p>	
7. De-ratifications	<p>Five student groups were tabled for de-ratification with the context provided.</p> <p>The Executive <b>approve</b> all de-ratifications.</p>	
8. Royal Holloway Sports Pass	<p>LB leads a discussion into the recently implemented Royal Holloway Sports Pass by Active Lifestyle and Sport before asking key questions.</p> <p>Is the Pass a barrier to access?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Pass is acting as a barrier and putting students off developing a causal relationship with sports and other activities.</li> <li>- It's putting an extra step in trying out activities and putting an extra burden on sports when trying to drive memberships due to the fact students are being forced to purchase the membership before joining.</li> <li>- The pass has been a particular barrier for recruiting first year students and has been a contributing factor in lower numbers in returning students.</li> <li>- The value for money isn't there. Slots are always booked or available at times where classes and seminars are being hosted. There is no attraction for it with so many limiting factors.</li> <li>- It's driving a divide between societies and clubs as the clubs are being disproportionately disadvantaged by these changes.</li> </ul> <p>Is the cost feasible?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The cost isn't a fair charge if you're having to pay for it just to try an activity.</li> <li>- The value for money isn't there.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The fee should be proportional to the activity rather than a blanket fee.</li> </ul> <p>What if there was another charge for term 2?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not when you consider the fact students will have paid for this term and then not be able to use it for two of the three months they are here.</li> <li>- Not when there's no transparency or information as to where the money is going.</li> <li>- There needs to be a grace period at the start of term two if it is implemented again.</li> <li>- Putting in another charge greatly reduces the work being done to increase access and inclusion.</li> <li>- Some students are already in a position where even £10 is the difference between paying a bill or not.</li> </ul> <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The constant mixed communication is causing confusion and is causing stress for committee members in trying to support members manage their money to be able to join in.</li> <li>- One of the 'reasons' given for the Sports Pass was linking it to track and trace, yet on not one instance a particular student has used the facilities, has someone checked their pass, track and trace, or student ID. This reason then is invalidated, especially as library services use student ID only.</li> </ul>	<p>Feedback the lack of track and trace check-in with ALS</p>
<p>9. AOB</p>	<p>MB provides and update on work being done to support the funding of student groups and how it has changed over recent years. Funding as usual hasn't been able to take place over the summer period where it normally would and a compromise has been identified to provide extraordinary funding for term two.</p> <p>There will be two tiers of funding available with those at higher risk of impact due to COVID-19 having access to further funding. There is no guarantee that all groups that apply will receive it, but the process will be as simple as possible to reduce the burden on groups.</p> <p>MB seeks two members of SSO to be part of the panel that will decide where funding will be provided, based on the applications.</p> <p>PD asks how the Executive would like to be communicated with, whether that's through MS Teams, a blended approach or email only. The Executive agree on a blended approach.</p>	<p>Members to complete form if to be part of student group funding panel.</p>