



FELIX REVIEW APPOINTMENT GROUP

The second meeting of the Felix Review Appointment Group for the 2016/17 session, was held on Wednesday 29th March 2017 at 10.00am in SMG office, Students Union, Beit Quad.

Present:	Lef Apostolakis (LA) Andrew Keenan (AK) Nas Andriopoulos (NA)	Felix Editor Head of Student Voice & Communication Union President
In Attendance:	James McDonald (JM)	Administration Support Coordinator

- AK gives an overview of the previous meeting
- AK feels there should be two documents produced. One a Terms of Reference for the Felix Review Appointment Group and a Review Brief to approach potential reviewers.
- The aim is for the Felix Review Appointment Group to unanimously agree on both documents, failing which advice will be sort from the Communications Committee
- Discussion around *Matters for discussion during review*
 - o 5.1 – *Felix’s Core Purpose*
 - LA fears this could enter a review of the philosophical role of student press
 - AK states that is more to have physical document regarding the purpose of Felix
 - o 5.2 – *Student expectations of Felix’s content*
 - LA notes that this will change over time and so therefore doesn’t want to constrict future editors to the current feeling
 - o 5.3 – *Felix’s funding model, including paid roles, advertising, printing and equipment*
 - LA unhappy about Felix paid editorship being discussed.
 - AK and NA disagree and feel to fully review the financial model of Felix, the paid editorship should also be reviewed.
 - AK feels that this is a difficult question that will need to be asked so is better to ask as part of a full review.
 - AK feels this is most opportune time to demonstrate the need and value of a paid editor
 - NA notes that the review will make recommendations not state requirements
 - o 5.4 – *Felix’s use of print and online channels*
 - Will change ‘use’ to ‘balance’
 - LA states print is how Felix makes money
 - o 5.5 – *Felix’s governance and accountability structures*
 - AK states this is about accountability and to formalise the process.
 - LA feels this is too broad a discussion point and should be more direct
 - AK states that these are headings and will be unpacked further
 - o 5.6 - *Felix’s Legal compliance structures*
 - AK states this is how Felix gets advice with media lawyers, experienced journalists.

- NA This is to formalise a procedure which provides confidence for both future Felix editors and the Board of Trustees
- 5.7 – *Felix's editorial structure*
 - AK states this is to give a clearer formalised picture as to how Felix editors interact
- 5.8 and 5.9 – *Felix's relationship with Imperial College Union and Imperial College London*
 - Felix is part of the Union, but considered by many as being entirely separate.
 - Felix's relationship with College is vaguer.
- 5.10 – *Roles and responsibilities of student participants in Felix*
 - The Union have an Investing in Volunteers awards which requires role descriptions available to volunteering positions. This is something that is hoped to spread to all CSPs.
- 5.11 – *Support and training for student participations in Felix*
 - Similar to 5.10, but with increased links to the Training and Development Manager
 - Aim to help all who contribute to Felix as much as possible with the correct training and to formalise a process.
- The reviewer will give recommendations, but these are not binding. They will go to Union Council and the Board of Trustees for approval
- If recommendations are approved by Board and Council, they will still take a long time to implement.
- LA would like a further matter to be discussed being the expectations of contributors and editors.
- LA would like another further matter to be reviewed around the value of Felix to the Union, to College, to students and to the editorial team.
 - NA and AK agree and feel this could be placed as the second major point for review
- Attendees decided that points 5.7 and 5.10 can be merged into one.
- The ideal independent reviewer is someone who has not been involved in Felix, external to Imperial who is experienced in the journalist world, ideally with Editorial experience.

Action Point – LA to review Matter for Discussion in further detail and will give a response to AK by the end of Friday