

**Board of Trustees**

The first ordinary meeting of the Board of Trustees for the 2019/20 session, was held on Wednesday 30th October in Meeting Room 1 and 2, Beit Quad at 2pm.

Unconfirmed minutes

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Present:** | Jill Finney (Chair) | Board of Trustees Chair and External Trustee |
|  | Graham Parker (GP) | External Trustee |
|  | Kate Owen (KO) | External Trustee |
|  | Dorothy Griffiths (DG) | External Trustee |
|  | Abhijay Sood (AS) | Union President |
|  | Lloyd James (LJ) | Council Chair |
|  | Thomas Fernandez-Debets (TFD) | Deputy President (Clubs and Societies) |
|  | Fi-Fi Henry (FH) | Deputy President (Finance and Services) |
|  | Ashley Brooks (AB) | Deputy President (Education) |
|  | Shervin Sabeghi (SS) | Deputy President (Welfare) |
|  | Ansh Bhatnagar (AB) | Elected Student Trustee |
|  | Daniel Faehndrich (DF) | Elected Student Trustee |
|  | Milia Hasbani (MH) | Appointed Student Trustee |
|  | Jinpo Xiang (JX) | Appointed Student Trustee |
| **In Attendance:** | Jarlath O’Hara (JOH) | Managing Director |
|  | Malcolm Martin (MM) | Head of Finance and Resources |
|  | Thomas Newman (TN) | Head of Student Experience |
|  | Julia Mattingley (JM) | Commercial Services Manager |
|  | Keriann Lee (KL) | Head of Student Voice and Communication |
|  | Richard Beet | Administration Support Officer (Clerk) |
| **Apologies:** |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item 01 – Welcome and Chair’s Business**   1. The Chair welcomed the group to the first Board meeting of the 2019/20 session. 2. EDI training – The Chair briefed the board regarding the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion training which is scheduled to take place before the next Board meeting on Wednesday 11th December. The Chair noted that this would be the first training session that the Board has undertaken as a group. The training session will include a short questionnaire at first, followed by a presentation and discussion on a strategic approach to managing EDI; including a section looking at driving factors for leadership and the impact of unconscious bias. 3. DG, DF and KO said that they would not be able to attend due to prior commitments; GP said that whilst he would be available he would only be able to be in London for a limited time. The Chair offered to move the EDI training to the following Board meeting or arrange a date that was separate to the Board meeting dates. DG said that her and KO have already received thorough EDI training so they assured the Board that they can go ahead as scheduled. The Chair elected to go ahead with the original scheduled date (11th December 2019).   **Item 02 – Conflict of interest declaration**   1. None declared.   **Item 03 – Apologies**   1. None.   **Item 04 – Board of Trustees Meeting minutes from 3rd July 2019**     1. ***Item 16 (PG Engagement) –*** The chair asked after the progress made on this work. JOH answered that it was still ongoing and in fact it was being undertaken as part of the sub-committee review, the reason being that the review would make it clear whether or not PG engagement should sit with one particular committee or across multiple committees. 2. The Chair acknowledged this rationale and added that it would be beneficial to allocate it sooner rather than later. JOH disagreed; it is currently a standing item for every sub-committee, but this is proving to be unproductive. JOH does not believe this can be resolved by any one sub-committee and hence this is why JOH is incorporating this work into the overall sub-committee review. JOH informed the Chair that PG engagement will be assigned at the end of the academic year. 3. The Chair asked if it really needed to take that long to complete. AS answered that it is difficult to fast track this work due to the need to provide assurance that our PG trustees have oversight of embedding this work into ICU’s processes. AS said this would best be accomplished by distributing PG trustees across the sub-committees (which has been done) and as the year proceeds they will be able to see which sub-committee (or sub-committees) would suit being responsible for PG engagement. 4. The Chair opened the question to the Board and asked if they were happy for this model of working to proceed. DG observed that it is important to bear in mind how this work connects with the other tasks that ICU is working on this academic year; it may not be the biggest priority. 5. GP said to the Chair that in his opinion this work should not be left to the end of the academic year, or there is a risk that no meaningful progress can be made; with that in mind it is important to know what the actual goal of this task is. JOH responded that he believed that there is a conflation of issues – namely the sub-committee review and PG engagement. PG engagement feeds into all aspects of the Union’s work and consequently affects the strategy throughout the year, but only forms part of the sub-committee review, which is a governance and framework piece that is concluded at the end of the academic year. GP acknowledged this explanation, but asked, since PG engagement will require a change in our processes, whether or not these changes can be implemented in good time. AS replied that this issue has already being taken up by the Union Council, and the PG Trustees provide a link between Union Council and Board, thus assuring ICU that this work is underway. 6. The Board of Trustees otherwise confirmed the minutes as an accurate record of the meeting held on 3rd July 2019.   **Item 05 - Action tracker and forward agenda**   1. The Board reviewed the action tracker, noting that most actions arising were either complete or delegated to sub-committees, with the exception of those noted below. 2. ***Renegotiation of hall prices*** – AS noted this had been expected to be done, however this has not been completed yet as we are dependent on colleagues from Imperial College to interface with ICU. 3. ***EDI*** – The current DPW is continuing his predecessor’s working in building a relationship with the Assistant Provost (EDI) with the aim of developing an effective representation structure and to celebrate the diverse community at Imperial College. This work is ongoing. As discussed during Chair’s Business, a training session for Board is scheduled for Wednesday 11th December.   **Item 06: H&S Report:**   1. JOH summarized the report as tabled; no major incidents have been reported, however JOH noted the recent visit from the Environmental Health Office which reduced ICU’s score from 3/5 to 2/5. 2. JOH said that funding for the renovation of flooring in the Activity spaces in Beit Quad, a matter he previously considered closed, now must be revisited as he is no longer certain whether the funding (that is to be provided by Imperial College) will be received by Christmas, or whether it will be received over the next year instead. 3. DG asked if Imperial College will no longer fund it at all. JOH responded that Imperial College will still provide the £50k in full, it is just a question of the timeframe in which this money will be provided to ICU. 4. MH asked JOH what the green section of the pie chart was referring to as it was not notated. JOH apologized for this and promised he would clarify this for MH. (*JOH was able to later clarify with MH that the green section referred to work-related injuries).*   **Item 07: People, Appointments and Remuneration Committee minutes from 18th September**   1. KO summarized the proceedings of the last meeting as recorded. SS summarized the ongoing discussions at PARC, noting its priorities are managing the recent high number of vacancies within ICU,and improving the relationship between ICU and its student volunteers. 2. Blind recruitment – SS said that Angela is leading on this. KO noted that this connects with ongoing EDI work. 3. MH asked what item 7.5 referred to. JOH said that this item referred to the difficulties of inducting CU presidents at the same time as OTs (referring to training activities such as the Board Away Day etc.) Various options to remedy this have been considered, however upon reflection the conclusion was that the CU president induction is best done separately to the induction for Officer Trustees. 4. AS clarified that there was an effort to induct CU Presidents during the same time period as the Officer Trustees, but due to staff absence it was not possible to do this successfully. JOH added that this issue has been included in the business plan. TFD added that there is an additional update on this issue in his report, which will be discussed later in the agenda.   *DG left the meeting briefly.*  **Item 08 – Communications Committee Minutes from 17th September**   1. TFD summarized the proceedings of the last Communications Committee meeting as recorded. 2. JOH said he is negotiating with ICT to provide Imperial College email accounts for all the external trustees, and assured the Board updates will be made available at the next Communications committee. 3. TFD noted that he remembered discussing an item that was not noted in the minutes. This addition to can be retrospectively added and approved at next committee (item 12) 4. TFD noted that KL has decided that a plan for marketing activities over the coming year (see item 13) is required in order to ensure budgets are adhered to, and this will be discussed further at the next Communications Committee. 5. JF asked if ICU is able to communicate how ICU has acted upon the feedback received from NSS and PRES, as she said this would be a good way to promote and encourage student participation. JOH responded that this is undertaken jointly with Imperial College, and the collaborative nature of the task dictates how ICU proceeds; JOH noted it is not a process that is embedded with the current cohort of Officer Trustees. JF advised that they should consider doing this. 6. MH asked if a plan has been completed for the Officer Trustee communications strategy. AS said that this was meant to be ready earlier, however sickness prevented AS from doing this. AS assured Board members that he will circulate this strategy at the next Communications committee as well as the next Union Council session. AS provided a brief overview of the Officer Trustees Communications Strategy.   **Item 09: Governance Committee minutes from 11th September**   1. AS summarized the proceedings of the last meeting as recorded.   **Item 10: Finance and Risk Committee minutes from 16th October**   1. GP said that FH and MM would give a summary of the proceedings of the last Finance and Risk meeting, but first he asked to give a statement regarding the last Finance and Risk Committee. GP said that he was attracted to serve with ICU as an external trustee two years ago because of his high regard for Imperial College students, and indeed he has employed several graduates throughout his career and has been pleased with their ability and further impressed by the reputation of Imperial College. However he believed that the reputation of Imperial College Union was at risk by what he could only describe as ongoing shambolic standards of management of ICU, where things that should be getting done are not, and problems that needed addressing are not. He referred to an observation he made when he began his tenure as an external trustee that management was functioning akin to hamsters with their own wheels, and he would use that same analogy now. He said there is still a serious lack of connectivity and purpose within the organization, and he expressed this in the context of his experience of the last finance and risk committee, because as recorded in the minutes of that meeting, there were a number of issues that frustrated him; these problems included the meeting taking place on graduation day, which resulted in the meeting being inquorate as Officer Trustees were absent. GP said that this meeting should not have taken place and should have been rescheduled. In addition there were items removed from the agenda as reports due for discussion (in particular the balanced scorecard) had not been prepared. This meant assurance requested by Board in matters such as finances and health and safety was not provided in any way. GP commented further, regarding the balanced scorecard, that this does not contain any information to indicate the general wellbeing of the organization. GP said that the Board is aware that ICU is running a deficit budget this year, and this budget was approved on the understanding that proper practices would be maintained to provide assurance that investments address their objectives; the lack of such information means ICU cannot know whether the budget is working as intended. GP mentioned the standard of the minutes themselves, with which he was very disappointed. He said he had to spend many hours correcting them. He said his biggest disappointment with the minutes was that they were passed to him with the assurance that they had been reviewed and corrected, which in this case was not true. GP said that procrastination in managing health and safety has left ICU vulnerable. GP did not say that progress had not been made, but that not enough action has been taken. GP referred in particular to the lack of an effective health and safety policy, and said that it was unforgivable that ICU has been trading for so long without such a policy in place. GP apologized to the Board for speaking at length, but he believed everything he said to be true and needed to be said. GP then invited FH to summarize the proceedings of the last F&R committee.   *DG rejoined the meeting.*   1. FH summarized the proceedings of the last Finance and Risk meeting as recorded, and noted additional reports to Board that were requested for this meeting (see item 10 on the agenda). FH noted a health and safety working group had convened to address gaps in Health and Safety management but added that the lack of meaningful progress is an ongoing concern. 2. JOH thanked GP for his statement, and acknowledged that management of the issues GP raised had fallen below acceptable standards. JOH said that the past twelve months had been difficult due to organizational issues caused by staff turnover which aggravated the ongoing financial difficulty. He said that the balanced scorecard tracks finance and staffing issues, which in his opinion does allow ICU to track the key challenges it faces. JOH said that managing priorities needed to improve as attempting too much at once leads to a lack of connected thinking and focus. He asked the Board for continued support to identify which priorities are critical. 3. JF thanked GP and FH for their statements concerning the last Finance and Risk Committee, and requested that JOH provide a robust response to GP’s statement by the end of the next week, and added that an inquorate Finance and Risk Committee must not happen again. 4. MM summarized the additional report concerning EPOS as tabled, and noted a lack of resolutions despite some early gains. JF asked MM why the report was tabled lacking substantive information, and GP also asked for further details. MM said that the lack of a systems manager is frustrating efforts to properly resolve the situation. JF said that given the delays noted in the report there was a risk that the £85k sum invested in EPOS systems for the whole financial year may be written off. MM said he acknowledged the impact on sales and student experience. MM said that the service provider was recommended to ICU in good faith, and ICU undertook its own research to identify OrbisTech as a suitable provider. JF noted again that the report tabled had no solution. MM responded that a head chef and systems manager need to be in place in order to resolve the issue properly. 5. AS said that the OrbisTech has not provided the level of service expected, and there is nothing that can be done now that has happened, but he asserted that something needed to be done now to avoid both reputation and financial damage. MM responded that of the five EPOS machines that were out of action, three are due for replacement, and noted that alternative mobile-based solutions have provided relief, in particular the use of mobile-based EPOS. MM said that JM is taking the lead on resolving this issue. 6. DG asked whether or not ICU could make use of Imperial College’s till facilities. JOH said that this has been attempted before but causes more problems than it solves and is not a viable solution. 7. JF said that given the scale of the problem, the report tabled did not provide any assurance to Board. MM responded that it had been agreed at the last finance and risk committee that a brief report would be tabled as an addendum to the minutes, and agreed a detailed plan is required. JF requested that this is done within the next two weeks. JF added that OrbisTech are in breach of contract and have been so for a long time, and it is critical that this is resolved. 8. MM summarized the additional report concerning Health and Safety as tabled. JF asked GP if the report agreed with his understanding of the situation. GP clarified that he was not satisfied with a verbal update and so requested this paper to be presented to Board. GP said that things have progressed since this report was written and noted the meeting mentioned by FH (see item 10.2) which he found encouraging. 9. TFD said that he echoed GP’s concern and the meeting that was referred to in item 10.2 concluded that a mapping exercise should be undertaken as soon as possible. TFD said that projects are already underway concerning health and safety improvements within Beit Quad. GP asked TFD to ensure there is as much buy-in from stakeholders across ICU as possible as it will ensure that the Health and Safety policy will be swiftly embedded into ICU’s operations. 10. MM offered to circulate the minutes of the Health and Safety Working Group to Board. JF agreed. 11. MM summarized the additional report on the internal audit recommendations as tabled. GP asked MM firstly if seven out of ten recommendations have been implemented, can it be concluded that 70% of this work is complete; secondly, if 70% of the work is complete, is it correct to conclude that 70% of the expenditure necessary to implement the audit’s recommendations has been spent. MM said that one of the key issues discussed with the internal auditors was staff turnover. Whilst current staff can fill some of the gaps created by key vacancies, only experienced staff in the proper posts can resolve the risks identified in the internal audit. 12. JOH agreed with MM and said that ICU can just about cope if a single key member of staff leaves the organization, but if multiple staff members ICU cannot cope without falling short of its key deliverables. JF asked KO to comment on this. KO said JOH’s comments are an accurate description of the situation. DG added that student unions work in a similar environment of high turnover. KO said that there was a need to break this cycle and to avoid firefighting. DG said that this was a difficult situation for management to face. 13. SS said that whilst staff turnover is high in areas such as bar service, where high turnover is not unexpected, he expected staff in key posts such as Operations Manager to have longer tenures, and recommended that this be an area for closer focus. JOH agreed with these comments.   **Item 11/ Item 12 – Annual Report / Letter of Representation**   1. MM summarized the Trustee’s Report and audit as tabled. TFD noted several inaccuracies. Firstly on page 9 it says that Imperial College provided a £1.8k block grant when in fact it is much higher. Secondly, on page 9, it says that there are £1.5k of investments into ICU, which is inaccurate. Thirdly, on page 20, it says that £35k was distributed to CSPs; TFD said this figure is actually closer to £400k. 2. SS asked JF if the letter of representation needed to be signed urgently. JF said that the answer was yes if ICU was to avoid embarrassment. JF said that she will sign the letter of representation, but the Trustees Annual Report must be proofed again before they can sign it. 3. JF subsequently signed the letter of representation on behalf of the Board.   **Item 13 – Business Plan**   1. JOH summarized the paper as tabled, then invited questions. 2. JF asked if staff turnover should be included in the business plan, given the discussions on staff turnover. JOH said that it is not explicitly stated by itself but it is contained within various sections. KO said that staff turnover could be included in the ‘laying the right foundations’ section. JOH asked KO if he was to do this, could she specify how exactly it should be included. 3. DG asked if it was on the scorecard. JOH confirmed this information was present on the scorecard, and added that both he and AS are working to present information pertaining to staff turnover on both the balanced scorecard and the business plan. 4. FH said that key staff wellbeing information was not explicit enough in terms of including student staff in this also (within the ‘creating a great culture’ section). JOH thanked FH for this feedback and said he will work with FH to ensure wellbeing of student staff is properly reflected.   **Item 14 – strategy**  *KL, JM and TN joined the meeting.*   1. In addition to the paper on the Union Strategy, AS and JOH gave a presentation summarizing the 19/20 strategy, referring to the rationale for producing the strategy, lessons learned from previous union strategies in addition to examples of best practice that were incorporated into the strategy, such as the Kaplan/ Norton model of the balances scorecard, for which AS and JOH praised LJ for his work in researching this example of best corporate practice. They highlighted that the strategy is not set in stone and welcomed comments and suggestions from the Board and commended the overall strategy as it stands for approval by the Board. 2. GP asked if Imperial College had its own student engagement policy, and if so, how closely does their policy and ICU’s policy align. SS said that Imperial College’s policy in this regards deals mostly with services. 3. In addition GP said there was a need to decide who does what, i.e. what should Imperial College be taking ownership of and what should ICU be taking responsibility for. JOH responded that these two factors are interlinked; the strategy would decide what Imperial College Union will be responsible for, and subsequently ICU would hold Imperial College to account for matters it leaves to them to take ownership of. DG noted this is part of the partnership piece with Imperial College, and it is important to highlight how ICU’s and Imperial College’s strategies align. 4. MH asked how the role of the funding sub-group fits in the wider strategy. JOH acknowledged that ultimately these different groups will need to come together. JOH noted that the main funding body currently is Imperial College. JOH said that currently the financial model is very stretched so there is a need to furnish the wider objectives and goals of ICU with a closer review of the financial model, in particular, what matters are being funded by Imperial College, and what matters have ICU decided needs to be done and therefore needs to be funded separately. MH responded that she understood the answer, but asked if it would not make sense for Finance and Risk Committee to undertake this work, since they were already equipped to deal with such matters. JOH replied that there was indeed cross-over between membership of the funding sub-group and the Finance and Risk Committee but that committee already has a full set of standing items to deal with and so it made sense to create a separate body to provide meaningful input in to the strategy. 5. SS asked, regarding the funding sub-group, whether or not the responsibility of negotiation lay with someone outside of the funding sub-group. AS replied that he and FH are responsible for negotiating with Imperial College. SS asked if this had been decided prior to the creation of the funding sub-group. JOH said no. SS added that he asked only as he was not sure FH had the proper stakeholder relationships in order to negotiate successfully. JOH acknowledged that this was a fair point to raise but tangential needs of the process dictate who will negotiate; JOH envisioned that an external trustee, an Officer Trustee and an external trustee would carry out the negotiations. 6. MH and SS said that they felt the rationale behind the memberships of the strategy sub-groups is not clear. JOH responded that the memberships were decided based on feedback from Board members on who was available and so on but welcomed input from OTs, and invited OTs to put themselves forward if they wished. 7. JF said that she would prefer that the strategy contains specific deadlines that would demonstrate the actual workload required to deliver the objectives of the strategy on time, and in a wider context, JF said it would be preferable that the strategy should be a lower priority than righting problems with basic operations, as discussed earlier in the meeting. 8. DG said that student trustees are welcome to suggest changes to the membership of the strategy sub-groups.   **Item 15- Summer Ball**   1. JM summarized the report as tabled and invited comments and questions. 2. DG asked if the figures referred to in the report are in an outsourcing scenario or in-house. JM responded that the costings given in the report are forecasting for in-house delivery, and outsourcing has not been formally costed. 3. DG asked what the experience was of the last summer ball. FH said that overall, 1,700 students attended. AB noted that there were not so many PG students there. 4. DG asked if it was not viable to facilitate the summer ball in-house and if so, do we need to charge for tickets? MH said that there is a third option which is to scale down the size. FH said that she would argue we should not look at the summer ball as a commercial event, but as a student experience event. FH commented that there is a need for greater student engagement, and she noted that there was no input from students to identity ways to improve the delivery of the summer ball. 5. KO noted there had been previous work with Officer Trustees that echoed the need for greater involvement from the student and body. KO said that there is a symbolic quality to the summer ball; it is a crucial point of the student life cycle. FH agreed that it would be a great shame if this was taken away from the students, and said that ICU needs more students to get involved to make the summer ball happened. DG replied that from her own experience students started enthusiastically but as the year progresses their enthusiasm waned and it eventually fell to permanent staff to deliver the event. 6. LJ replied that there is a need to recognize many student volunteers are already actively engaged in the delivery of the summer ball and thus they have a wealth of experience in running events; but they are not able to share their experience with ICU. LJ also noted that Union Council has an interest in seeing student volunteers being more actively engaged with the delivery of the summer ball. 7. TFD agreed with LJ’s comments, and said similar events of scale are run by other CSPs; these CSPs have knowledge and experience but ICU is not empowering them to help facilitate such events. TDF said that he appreciated that there are staff limitations, but these can be compensated by what the CSPs can offer. There is potential for IC to make use of this and to subsequently relieve pressure of union staff. TFD said it is important to note along with graduation and welcome week these form three main student recognition events. 8. AS said ICU can approach Imperial College for assistance with running this event as they are very keen for us to deliver the summer ball. AS noted that despite DG’s experience, he has seen student volunteers put the work in on the night to get the work done. AS noted that there is an opportunity now to bring in these CSPs to help the process of organizing the summer ball. FH added that she had a potential timeline ready for input as well as students who are named and ready to contribute. 9. JOH said that ICU does not have a credible plan for how to deliver the summer ball, and it was right of JM to table this report to ensure this issue was discussed at Board. 10. FH noted that a timeline is available as she mentioned. AS noted this work was done before the report was tabled and it was a shame this was not factored in before Board. 11. JF noted there was a strong will to deliver the summer ball, but JM does not have anyone available to take overall responsibility. 12. FH said she would take overall responsibility until a new events manager is hired. JF said that FH would be answerable to ICU should she take the responsibility to own this, and praised FH for the work done so far. JF asked if the Board would agree that FH take on the remit of summer ball. DG said yes but there is still the need for the vacancies within commercial services to be filled, and resources required are delivered. Whether with outside hire, IC funding or with other options, there is a clear need for the enthusiastic work of the students to link up successfully with that of ICU staff. TFD noted he is meeting next week with college stakeholders that have been identified. 13. GP agreed with the conclusions of the discussion but noted that the question going forward is how much ICU wants to give in terms of human resources and finance resources. AS replied these costings would be prepared for approval at sub-committee. 14. The Board approved FH to own this remit.   **Item 16 – proposal for an additional PG Trustee**  *TN and MM and KL left the meeting.*   1. AS summarized the report as tabled and invited questions. 2. AB clarified to AS, whether the intention is to introduce a new PGT Trustee, PGR Trustee or any PG Trustee. AS replied the intention so far was to have a PG Trustee. 3. SS asked if the role should be remunerated. JOH said that it should be remunerated. SS asked if doing so would fit within ICU’s legal framework. JOH confirmed this was so. 4. AB asked if Union Council would be able to meaningfully approve the proposal given that for many members it would be their first meeting. AS responded that there is a training session taking place the day before the Union Council meeting in order to provide essential training and information to assist new members. 5. TFD expressed concern that reserving a trustee for PG is unfair. DF added there was a risk of creating an imbalance of representation on Union Council. JOH noted that this discussion would be best handled by Union Council. DF asked if there has been a cohort of student trustees that did not contain a PG student. JOH said that there has been at least one cohort without a PG student. DG suggested that there is a meeting with Imperial College tomorrow which would be ideal propose the idea for further discussion   *Due to time constraints, the Chair invited a very brief summary of the following reports to be shared with the Board.*  **Item 17 – Managing Director’s Report**   1. JOH provided a brief summary of the report as tabled. JOH noted record turnout in the Autumn Elections.   **Item 18 – Non-SK Working Group**   1. JOH had given a verbal update regarding this matter earlier in proceedings, and so was not raised on.   **Item 19 – Union President’s Report**   1. AS provided a brief summary of the report as tabled. AS noted NSS and PRES have been produced and circulated, and have been well received by stakeholders.   **Item 20 – DPE Report**   1. AB provided a brief summary of the report as tabled. AB noted NSS and PRES have been produced and circulated, and have been well received by stakeholders.   **Item 21 – DPW Report**   1. SS provided a brief summary of the report as tabled. JF praised DFW for his intention to reintroduce a welfare column in Felix.   **Item 22 – DPCS Report**   1. TFD provided a brief summary of the report as tabled. Nothing major to note.   **Item 23 – DPFS Report**   1. FH provided a brief summary of the report as tabled. FH noted a 70% increase in sponsorship contracts.   **Item 24 – Council Chair’s Report**   1. LJ provided a brief summary of the report as tabled. JF praised LJ for his work in streamlining the Union Council policies.   **Item 25 – AOB**   1. MH said that the appointed student trustees have still received an induction yet. JOH replied that he is aware of this and will get in touch with appointed trustees as soon as possible. 2. AB asked if there had been any progress with the online petition system TFD responded that it is in the pipeline for the Systems Team to create but other matters such as the Union Shop are taking priority at the moment. TFD said he expected the online petition system to be rolled out by end of the academic year. JOH said he would circulate a timetable to Board. | **MM to circulate minutes of HSWG**  **Final draft of TAR to be completed ASAP**  **LJ and AS to report back regarding UC discussion** |

***Next Board of Trustees meeting: Wednesday 11th December 2019***

**Summary of discussion Items:**