

Ratification of Appointed Student Trustee Recruitment Recommendations

1.0 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 The 2013 governance review included a reform of the make-up of the Union's Board of Trustees. One of the key changes to the Board was the introduction of two appointed Student Trustee roles.
- 1.2 The intention of the introduction of these positions was to:
 - 1.2.1 Ensure that a wide range of student backgrounds and viewpoints were represented on the Board
 - 1.2.2 To provide continuity and consistency to the Board by ensuring that some student members didn't change at the end of the academic year
 - 1.2.3 Provide opportunities for student to become members of the Board who may not be comfortable in an election or campaigning environment.
- 1.3 Following the approval of a process at the October 2013 meeting of the Board of Trustees, the Union has been through the process of selecting 3 students; 2 of which were appointed for a 1 year term and 1 who was appointed for a 2 year term.
- 1.4 This paper seeks to outline and review the recruitment process and to make recommendations on appointments to the Board for the 2 vacant positions.

2.0 Process

- 2.1 The position of Appointed Student Trustee was advertised to students through the Union's website, student newspaper, and social media channels. Information regarding the role was available on the Union's recruitment site and a recruitment pack was developed which outlined key information about the Union, the Board, the role and the appointment process.
- 2.2 The person specification for the role outlined the desire of the Union to ensure that the perspectives of Female and International Students are reflected on the Board, but did not restrict applications to students from those groups.
- 2.3 On the request of the Board, the process for appointing the student trustees was scheduled to be completed by the end of October. The original deadline for applications was 19 October however as of that date, 2 applications had been received. The deadline was extended to allow for further applications.
- 2.4 In total 8 applications were received. The quality of the applications were in general very high with a good mix of Undergraduate and Postgraduate.
- 2.5 These applications were reviewed by the President who was assisted by Managing Director. The President developed a long list of 4, who were interviewed in face to face interviews by a panel.
- 2.6 Those who were unsuccessful in the first round were emailed to inform them of this and were given the opportunity to get feedback on their applications.
- 2.7 This panel consisted of Lucinda Sandon Allum (Officer Trustee) Jill Finney (Lay Trustee), John Winters (Appointed Student Trustee). Joe Cooper (Managing Director) assisted this process. The interviews were structured around a pre-prepared set of questions which linked directly to the person specification approved by the Board of Trustees.
- 2.8 Following the 4 interviews the panel discussed the relative merits of the shortlisted candidates and came to unanimous view on the preferred candidates.

2.9 Those who were unsuccessful after the interview were also given the opportunity to receive feedback on their application and interview.

2.10 The preferred candidates are an Undergraduate from the Faculty of Medicine and a Postgraduate studying Ecology, Evolution and Conservation at Silwood Campus.

Profile of applications

Male	Female	Undergraduate	Postgraduate	Home/EU	International	Department	How did they hear about positions
5	3	5	3	5	3	Physics (1)	Facebook (1)
						Medicine (2)	Email (4)
						Chemistry (1)	Twitter (1)
						Biology (1)	Union Website (2)
						Ecology, Evolution and Conservation (1) – Silwood Campus	
						Electrical Information Engineering (1)	
						Chemical Engineering (1)	

3.0 Reflection

3.1 Advertising of the positions was part of the start of term messages. It is difficult to substantiate that the low number of applications are due to the message getting lost in the overload of information however the low numbers are disappointing. The decision to bring the timetable in line with the Your Rep and Council elections makes sense; the successful applicant loses the October meeting experience by being appointed after the elections. However it may be that the message was confused or diluted by the sheer amount of messages.

4.0 Resolves

To ratify the appointments of (see appendix)

4.1 **Timothy Seers**

4.2 **Alexander Raposo**