

Meeting:	Postgraduate Committee
Date:	12 th November
Paper:	Postgraduate Committee Autumn 19
Author:	Scott Arthur
Purpose:	Record of Decision Making

uea|su

Minutes of the Postgraduate Committee 12/11/2019

Committee Members Present: Alicia Perez (Activities and Opportunities Officer), Amelia Trew (Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer), Sophie Atherton (Campaigns and Democracy Officer), Martin Marko (Postgraduate Education Officer), Benjamin Pinsent (AMA), Gina Kim (ENV), Lewis Martin (PPL), Subeer Sarkar (NBS), Megan Pay (PPL), Matthew Gallagher (PPL)

Chair: Matthew Gallagher (elected in meeting)

Apologies:

In Attendance: Josh Melling (Student Engagement Coordinator – PG), Scott Arthur (Advocacy Assistant)

101 Elect Chair and Deputy Chair of Committee

- SA introduces the election of chair, indicating for expressions of interest in the position.
- MG indicates a willingness to run for chair, and is given one minute to present a speech on why they are suitable for the position.
- MG delivers speech on their qualifications and suitability for the position.
- With the speech having finished, SA opens voting by show of hands.
- The vote is unanimous with 10 votes for MG and 0 for RON. MG is accordingly elected as committee chair.
- MG then initiates voting for the position of deputy chair, asking for expressions of interest.
- LM indicates their willingness to run, and is given one minute to present a speech on why they should be elected.
- LM presents this speech, informing the committee of their skills and suitability.
- With the speech completed, MG opens voting by show of hands.
- The vote is again unanimous, with 10 votes for LM and 0 for RON.

102 Statement from the Chair [s]

- As this is the first meeting, MG had not prepared a speech, but expressed a desire to keep the meeting effective and working on postgraduate issues. Further expressed the need for the meeting to be flexible and accessible. Indicated a willingness to change how the committee operates if it is deemed necessary by committee.

103 Minutes of Last Meeting

- JM explained that the minutes had already been approved by the last committee, and were provided for this meeting as a reference to previous discussions.
- MG suggested committee members take a look at the minutes of the last meeting to see what the committee was talking about in the last academic year.

104 Action Log

- MG introduced the action log, querying what had carried over from the last academic year.
- MP read out the action log from last meeting, introducing the points that were included – one point concerned the obtaining of a minibus for postgraduate events, the other indicated that a reflective paragraph and event photograph are now required as part of the conference fund application.
- MG queried whether anything had come out of the previous discussions regarding the renting of a minibus for use by postgraduates.
- AP commented that the previous officer had not mentioned the minibus situation to her during handover.
- JM clarified that this point was in regard to obtaining a minibus for summer events, and a minibus was privately hired to do this.

105 Moving of GCMG Remit to Postgraduate Committee

- MG introduced this piece, bringing MM into the conversation to explain why they had moved the motion.
- MM explained that all relevant information pertaining to the GCMG was available through the explanatory notes in the agenda and explained that the normal process was for this committee to elect members to the GCMG. However, MM indicated that there he perceived there to be a large degree of overlap between the remits of the two groups, especially in regard to the graduate centre. Initiated a conversation in regard to whether these bodies could be merged in some ways to avoid duplication of discussions.
- SA further explained the role of the GCMG, explaining that it looks into the day to day running of the Scholars Bar, and sits under the Management Committee. Explained that the Management Committee is made up of the five full time officers and looks at financial oversight and day to day management of various areas. Indicated concern at the proposal, suggesting that it would result in a vastly increased amount of work for this committee. Recommended against supporting this change, but indicated that this would have to be changed in the by-laws by Union Council.
- LM questioned how this would affect staff protocol in regard to the two groups.
- SA explained staff protocol; informing committee that it was not allowed to comment on staff conduct, behaviour or directly name staff who do not have the ability to reply to the comment. Further explained right of response – indicating that staff were not allowed to make overtly political comments or make comments of a non-factual manner.
- AP explained that staff could also not say things like 'good stuff' or criticise staff as this is seen to be of a non-factual nature.
- MM explained that the proposal would be to merge this committee and the GCMG in order to avoid duplication of discussion. Accepted that this would increase the workload of this committee, but expressed a belief that the GCMG was not being as effective as it could be. Indicated that if the GCMG was to stay, that he would like to see changes to make it more effective. Responded to LM, suggesting that staff protocol would not be significantly affected as this committee was similar to other committees – so the rules would not need to change.
- SA disagreed that this committee was not different to others. Argued that as this committee is PG specific group, and is interested in outreach and participation in this community specifically, it has a fundamentally different nature to other committees. Highlighted that the GCMG is similar to a Development and Oversight Board, and as a result it would be potentially impossible to combine the remits. Suggested a need to seek further advice on this topic – highlighting how this could remove the ability of staff to comment on financial matters due to their inability to comment in union meetings.
- LM used the example of something they had been involved in at the NUS, wherein staff had to comment on issues, but had no right of reply to criticism, which derailed any potential conversation. Indicated that keeping this committee separate enabled the ability to have a

conversation with staff members if necessary. Used further example from the NUS where a staff member expressed praise of the Teaching Excellence Framework, but invoked staff protocol when criticised in regard to this point.

- MG summarised that this committee is fundamentally a political body, while GCMG is predominately a management committee which falls outside of this committee's remit.
- MM responded that it can be kept provisionally the same, but expressed a willingness to seek further comment and information.

ACTION: MM to seek further comment and information, specifically in regard to separating the political and management roles of the groups and how issues around staff protocol can be resolved.

- BP Expressed confusion and sought further explanation in regard to the difference between this committee and the GCMG, and what would specifically change under MM's proposal.
- LM explained that this committee are able to be political and make comment on issues that arrive, while the GCMG is more concerned with how their space is used from a business standpoint. Explained that conflating the two could create awkwardness as staff need to be able to express opinion, something they would be unable to do in this space.
- MP queried how often this committee overruns its allocated time, with an interest in how adding an additional remit could effect this.
- JM clarified that only one meeting overran in the previous academic year.
- SA agreed that if the remits were merged, there would probably be a need to make these meetings longer.
- JM explained that GCMG meetings occur once a semester, and last for 90 minutes.
- MP concurred that this would add a considerable amount of time to the meetings of this committee.
- MG indicated that this could have an impact on accessibility, suggesting that PG students are already stretched for time, and these proposals would stretch that further.

106 Graduate Centre Management Committee (Sub-Committee of management Committee) [s]

- MG explained that it is required for this committee to nominate 2 members to sit on the GCMG. Explained that these meetings will take about 90 minutes, once a semester. Explained that it cannot be a full time officer.
- LM and MP indicated a willingness to participate.
- Both members unanimously confirmed, with 10 votes in favour, and 0 votes against & for RON.

107 Postgraduate(su) Budget

- MG introduced agenda item, pointing members towards the explanatory notes in the agenda. Introduced budget lines accordingly;

activities £6738, campaigns £512, social grant £4050 and conference fund £6200. Explained that most of these budgets were mostly spent in their entirety, with the exception of campaigns.

- BP explained that the budget has been reduced by £2670.
- JM clarified that with no amendments £3050 is set aside for ongoing costs (Assembly Pizza and Drinks, Swim Cards, Yoga etc).
- AP updated committee on sports provision – had previously asked UEA Sport to take over the provision that this committee currently provides. Summarised correspondence with UEA Sport which indicated that they have no inclination to do this. However, did add that she and MM would still take the paper to SEC (Student Experience Committee) but until these discussions take place she is not in a place to comment more.
- MP queried what specifically is being considered for UEA Sport to offer in place of this committee.
- AP clarified that PG Yoga and Swim Cards were the proposed changes to provision. Under these proposals, UEA Sport would offer these, in place of this committee.
- AP expressed a view that UEA Sport should already be offering this, and that it shouldn't be the place of this committee to make up this short fall.
- SA summarised that this would preserve the power of this committee to organise events throughout the year, but would decrease the responsibility to organise sporting events.
- MG explained that in the past a PG football tournament and a PG pool tournament have been organised separately from the regularly run events – which is the area that UEA Sport should be responsible for.
- LM asked the full time officers for the breakdowns of their SOC (Student Officer Committee) budgets – explaining that SOC has a pool of money which could be used by this committee to fund any areas where it has budgetary constraints.
- SA explained the budget of SOC, and what was allocated to different areas. As part of this, it was explained that SOC has at this moment not allocated any money to this committee. SA further suggested that money for this committee would only be approved if the issue was perceived to affect all students, and not just postgraduates.
- JM clarified that this committee regularly spends the vast majority of its budget.
- SA reiterated that she could not guarantee that any funding request to SOC would be successful.
- MG explained the options the committee could take – submitting a funding request to SOC, pressure UEA Sport to increase their offer, cut funding unilaterally, offer the services at an increased or decreased rate or continue to fund the provision as it is.
- AP raised the issue of increasing the cost of the swim cards so they are not sold at such a loss.
- MG responded that the costs were structured in such a way to maximise participation and the knock-on effects of this participation.
- MP queried the timeline for finalising this budget and the timeline for hearing back from SOC.

- SA answered that the budget can always be amended if necessary, and that SOC occurs the week after Union Council. Was explained that this request could not come before SOC before the 12th December at the earliest. Further explained that it would not be possible to submit this funding as an emergency motion.
- MG brought the discussion back to thinking about the funding for the upcoming year.
- MM indicated that the provision should definitely be continued forward as the feedback on the events has been overwhelmingly positive. Also noted that he would be amenable to a slight increase in prices.
- JM noted that if all activities were funded on the same level as last year it would reduce the budget to £9300. He further clarified that this is a similar situation to what happened with the committee last year.
- MM raised a point about the Norwich Research Park offering yoga sessions priced at £5 per person – he noted the disparity between the prices they charge and the prices this committee charges.
- MP commented that as someone who attends PG Yoga, she had first-hand seen the considerable demand for it, and noted that she may not go if it was priced in excess of £1. She further commented that many postgrads are not financially stable, so keeping costs low should be imperative.
- MG summarised that the yoga should continue to be funded, with AP ascertaining whether Sports SU will fund it, and with other officers ascertaining whether SOC funding could be used.
- SA commented that in regard to SOC funding, any application would have to be carefully worded in order to consider the wider student body and not just postgraduates.
- AP suggested continuing to fund the activities as they currently are, and utilising SOC should funds for campaigning be needed down the line.
- MG reiterated that he perceived a need for the committee to focus on its work as a political body, and that campaigning work should come before activities.

ACTION: SA, LM & MG to explore and evaluate the possibility of putting a funding request into SOC

ACTION: AP & MM to continue their actions with SEC and UEA Sport, and to pressure UEA Sport into potentially taking over the funding for these activities

- MG moved a vote to provisionally approve the funding of yoga at the same level as previously.
- Vote unanimously passed, with ten in favour and none against/abstaining.
- MG moved the conversation on to discussion about the PG swim cards, explaining that they are purchased at £2.55, and sold at £1. This would incur a cost of £1550 for the year.
- SA queried which category these cards fall into (i.e. peak, off peak etc)
- JM explained that they are the cheapest available, but work at any time, and sometimes work more than once.
- SA further queried the cost of swimming without the card.

- JM clarified that without an educational membership it costs £3.10 and with the membership it costs £2.80.
- MP highlighted that all students are eligible for this membership and thus are eligible for the reduced costs.
- JM responded that while all students are eligible, many students are unaware of this. Highlighted that the dedicated swim membership works out as more expensive than if you get the educational membership and only go once a week. Further highlighted that the PGC swim cards are even cheaper than this.
- GK encouraged students to look at the pool timetable, as that will indicate when students can go. The pool is sometimes used by clubs and societies so students need to bare this in mind. Also mentioned the possibility of further publicising the swimming as an option as many people are keen to participate in it.
- MG explained the purpose of providing swim cards, identifying it as two fold; to aid mental health and encourages chances for students to take their mind of work and teaching. Believed this to be different to yoga, as yoga is more of a community building event. Sought opinions in regard to whether the swimming should continue to be funded at the current level.
- LM reiterated that they did not believe SOC were likely to fund it, as it may be perceived to not be for the benefit of all students. Also highlighted that while the swim cards represent a significant outlay, demand remains permanently high so the outlay can be justified. Indicated that small changes in price can be made down the line if the budget needs to be adjusted.
- SA queried whether the costs could be spread out more throughout the year, with the committee purchasing cards on a monthly basis and not per semester.
- JM retorted that from a logistical stand point it is easier to do them on per semester. Explained that the amount of cards purchased entirely depends on how much funding is designated towards it.
- Raised a point about opening it up to other students, specifically mentioning HSC students and mature students – believing this to be an option to help the funding get through SOC.
- SA reiterated that despite these changes, there would still be issues in regard to passing it through SOC as it is explicitly for postgraduates and not for the student body as a whole.
- MP explained that swimming is a low impact exercise and as a result is more suited to people to people with injuries/illnesses when compared to something like yoga.
- MG moved a vote on provisionally keeping the funding the same until next semester and until the results of SOC and UEA Sport funding is known.
- Vote unanimously passed with ten members voting in favour, and none against.
- MG moved the conversation on to discussion of funding for Postgraduate Assembly.
- JM explained that this would come to approximately £300-£400 for the year.
- MG moved a vote on keeping the funding at the same level.

- Vote unanimously passed, with 10 members voting in favour, and none against.
- JM reminded committee that if swim cards are being funded per semester then the money will not 'come out' all at the same time – this is the same for the yoga as that is only paid when the committee receive an invoice from the instructor.
- MG summarised that the committee now had £9380 to spend on activities, campaigns, social grant and conference fund. Explained that swim cards and yoga were inclusive in the activities budget. Asked the committee for opinions in regard to what members viewed as the priorities for the year.
- JM clarified that it was important to view this as spending £15000 and not £9000 as the academic and financial years do not align. Explained the importance of using all of this money, where necessary.
- Committee spent some moments trying to clarify how the previous budgets were allocated with a specific regard for the percentages in question.
- MG indicated a desire to see the political arm of the committee prioritised in the upcoming year. Explained that the budget has seen a decrease of approximately 20% and thus a decision has to be made about adjusting funding accordingly.
- JM explained that GK had done the sums and worked out that 40% went to activities, 2% to campaigns, 23% to social grant and 35% to conference fund.
- BP commented that he believed this breakdown was reasonable, and that the remit of the committee was to support postgraduate students and this budget breakdown did that by ensuring activities and conference funding was optimised.
- MG asked whether the committee wanted the SU to prioritise events for all postgraduate students, or offer more cohort specific events.
- MM highlighted the importance of thinking about different demographics and tailoring events to match these.
- MG asked whether the committee would prefer to keep the percentages the same as in the last year, or would prefer to move money around accordingly.
- BP acknowledged that as the budget had decreased changes would need to be made. Raised the example of the conference fund and social grant being changed so that the maximum amount people can apply for is lower.
- SA raised a question about apportioning the budget in regard to certain timeframes.
- JM confirmed that this was at the discretion of committee, and could be apportioned however the committee wished. Mentioned that the specifics of the social grant and conference fund could be discussed in the next agenda item.
- LM advised that the committee split it into equal portions of £5000 for each semester, which could be adjusted and directed at the beginning of the semester.
- MM expressed confusion about doing this.
- MG explained that because the financial year and academic year do not line up, committee needs to treat the budget as if they have £15000 to spend.

- MG suggested provisionally assigning £1000 per month (plus/minus the difference).
- Committee concluded that keeping funding at the same percentages this year results in: £2000 per semester for activities, £1000 per semester for social grant, £1750 per semester for conference fund and £250 per semester for campaigns
- JM clarified that in the last year campaign funds were spent on research, Christmas drinks in Unio as well as a few other smaller events.
- SS queried whether demand for the conference fund was steady throughout the year, or whether it tended to peak at certain times.
- JM referred to it as a 'barrage' throughout the year and was mostly consistent.
- SS asked what happens once the budget is spent.
- JM responded that once the money has been spent it is done. Indicated that applications have been closed for many months due to insufficient funds.
- JM summarised that the yearly budget would be £6000 in activities, £300 in campaigns, £3250 in social grant and £5450 in the conference fund.
- MM suggested that SSF (Social Sciences Faculty) have a provision in their budget for conferences.
- SA queried where any proposed funding changes would come from.
- MM clarified that it wouldn't affect the social fund and that the committee could liaise with SSF to better coordinate funding.
- MG summarised that MM raises a good point, highlighting how university funding is sometimes available for postgraduate students to attend conferences.
- MM suggested that the committee funds be utilised to only fund students who do not have access to university funding.
- MG clarified that all postgraduate students have access to conference funding through their school.
- JM stated that applications which have not attempted to secure funding from their school are automatically rejected.
- MG summarised that the committee funds are there for students who do not have school funding available to them.
- MP expressed that in her personal experience there is not a great deal of funding available on the whole, especially for students who do not receive outside funding. Suggested that this makes the SU's funds all the more important.
- LM suggested that the SU's motto of 'students transforming' indicates exactly why conferences are so important. Stated that school and faculty funding is requested as quickly as the funding from this committee is.
- MG acknowledged that while this is repeating discussion from previous years, it is important to have the conversation as many committee members were not present during those discussions.
- MP suggested that the committee needs to remember the fact that its fund is inter-disciplinary, and independent of the separate rules and hurdles that need to be adhered to in schools and faculties.

- MG suggested that it is important to collate all the information on school and faculty funding so students are aware of this. But reiterated need for this committee to retain an independent fund.

Action: MM to collate all the separate information around school and faculty funding for conferences

- MG moved a vote to keep the funding as outlined.
- Vote unanimously passed, with ten members voting in favour and none against.
- The budget for the year is therefore; £6000 for activities, £300 in campaigns, £3250 in social grant and £5450 in conference fund.
- MG expressed gratitude to GK for calculating these numbers.

108 Conference Fund and Social Grant Procedures

- MG moved the meeting onto discussion of the procedures and guidelines for approving funding requests.
- JM clarified that last year, any conference fund request of in excess of £150 came to committee for approval. But said that this is of course subject to change.
- MG highlighted the need for accessibility to all students and suggested an upper limit of £100 unless in cases of exceptional circumstances.
- GK queried what specifically would cost £150 at a conference.
- Various voices informed her that travel, accommodation, conference fees etc all pile up.
- JM stated that it wasn't just for conferences either, people can apply for help funding research trips, access to archives etc
- MM raised a point about focusing on specific demographics, using the example of students who have transferred across faculties.
- MG admitted that this was a good point, and acknowledged that looking at funded vs self-funded students would be useful.
- MM also mentioned students who face different constraints because of their characteristics, but was unable to provide an example.
- MP mentioned how it was not particularly helpful to lump all funded students into one category, as funding varies immensely. Used the example of being funded by a research council as opposed to by a school or faculty as the former would award more funding support than the latter.
- JM expressed a willingness to include a question about who is funding applicants, as opposed to just how much funding they get.
- MP agreed that it is fair to create a distinction between funded and self-funded students, but acknowledged that it is different depending on how much funding a student receives.
- SA suggested a question requesting whether applicants are funded/self-funded and then another question asking for applicants to justify their application if they are funded already.
- JM commented that this may already exist, and that the current process is not to ask about who the funding is received from.

***Action: JM and SAR to add a question to the existing application about who applicants are funded by.**

Action: JM and SAR to add a notification that applications from students funded by a research council will automatically be brought to committee for discussion.

- MP reiterated that research councils tend to fund significantly more than schools, faculties or departments and the institutional level.
- MG stated that research council requests will now have to come to committee to be approved.
- MG moved a vote on these changes being approved
- Vote unanimously passed with ten members voting in favour, and none against.
- MG clarified that exceptional circumstances are decided on a case-by-case basis.
- MM mentioned the possibility of reserving funding for certain groups and characteristics.

Action: MG, MM and AT to discuss the possibility of reserving funding for certain groups of students, JM to assist with research and data.

- MG stated that he believed applications should be limited to one per academic year.
- LM disagreed, stating that there should be one automatic approval a year, and any further applications should automatically come to committee for approval.
- MG concurred with this amendment.
- JM stated that this was perfectly doable logistically as he is aware of previous applications. Further queried what the policy will be in regard to reimbursement – the current policy is to not reimburse if the activity has already taken place.
- MG stated that applications will have to be completed one month prior to the conference.
- AP queried the requirements to get automatic approval.
- JM confirmed that all applications are checked and scrutinised by staff, but applications are approved as long as they meet the minimum requirements.
- MG moved a vote to approve these changes to the conference grant.
- Vote was passed unanimously, with ten members in favour, and none against.

- LM proposed that item 111 & 114 be moved up the agenda due to time constraints. Further proposed that all other agenda items be moved to next meeting.

- MG moved on to discussion of the social grant, explaining that at the moment the maximum funding was £300.
- JM concurred with this, but explained that there is no automatic approval process for the social grant, and as always the committee was free to change this.
- MG suggested changing this limit to £250 to make it more accessible to all students.

- MM explained that these funds were not normally distributed on an individual basis, but more on a per-person basis as it caters for large groups. Argued this would mean less events, but that these events would potentially be bigger and of better quality if they had access to the full £300.
- SA proposed that any event with 80+ attendees could qualify for the full £300 in funding, while anything below that could qualify for £200.
- MG moves a vote to change the cap accordingly.
- Vote passes unanimously, with ten members voting in favour, and none against.
- JM clarified the process for discussing events – staff will bring them to committee and committee will discuss and approve accordingly.

111 UCU Strike Action

- MG introduced the item, explaining that UCU were going on strike between the 25th of November and 4th of December. And opened it up to the room to discuss how to approach the strike.
- SA stated that as a team, the officers have met with the Vice-Chancellor and Pro Vice-Chancellor for Academics. Outlined that the UEA executives do not want strike action. Explained that the officers have a meeting with UCU to discuss supporting the strike. Cited policy to support strike action by UCU and does not envisage this changing. Stated that officers will further discuss internally about the approach to it. Expressed willingness to create a working group to support the strike.
- LM asked JM whether the banners from last year were still in the office.
- JM believes UCU have taken them back to their office – as he couldn't find them when he looked.
- MG outlined that the support for last year came in the shape of producing materials for the strike, as well as teach ins. Requested that a similar level of support be applied this year.
- Said that this level of support depends on the discussion the officers have in the future. Acknowledged that she will not be here during the strike and would offer help and support from afar.
- MG suggested that one member of the officer team be identified to lead on supporting the strike.
- LM added that it would be useful for officers to liaise with UCU to ascertain specifically what they want in regard to support.
- SA queried whether the officer taking the lead on this would need to be present at the time of the strikes.
- MG confirmed that yes the officer would need to be present/
- LM suggested that MM should be on the picket line as often as possible, identifying that it would be hypocritical not to be, especially as MM is leading a campaign to get better working conditions for Associate Tutors.
- MG moved a motion for committee to mandate MM to participate in the strike as often as he can. Motion also mandates MM to inform the committee of potential scheduling gaps.
- Motion unanimously carried, with ten votes in favour and none against.

- LM clarified that funding for campaigning during the strike would likely come from SOC, but SOC will need to discuss specifically how much funding is required.
- MG announced the formation of a working group – consisting of MG, LM, SA, MM – to support the UCU strike.
- MM stated that as this committee represents postgraduates, it should come up with a statement to help inform discussion at SOC.
- MG concurred with this, agreeing that a statement supporting the strike will be drafted.

114 Sky House

- SA checked everyone was aware of what the Sky House is.
- Committee expressed its knowledge of the building project.
- SA outlined the conversations she has had with academics and board members about PGR space. Expressed a desire to hear the opinions of the committee in regard to this area.
- MG acknowledged that due to time constraints it would be wise to undertake these discussions outside of the meeting. Announced the formation of a working group – consisting of MP, LM, BP, MG, SA, AT and MM.
- JM made a point that MM is not the only postgraduate officer, and that he was not solely responsible for PG matters.
- AP agreed, highlighting that people get confused in regard to MM's remit, and reiterated that activities issues are solely her remit, welfare is solely AT's remit etc.
- BP stated that while he understands this, he perceived there to be a need for MM to participate in this group because it remained a fundamentally educational matter.
- MG named SA as head of the Sky House working group, with LM head of the UCU Strikes working group.

112 Big Shift Big Day

- MM very briefly introduced the Big Shift Big Day on employability.
- MG directed MM to further explain and arrange this through teams.

Action: MM to provide explanation of Big Shift Big Day through Microsoft Teams

115 NUS Report

- MM explained that 2k of funding is now integrated in the Vice-President for Higher Education's budget. Indicated that the national representatives can make decisions on its usage.
- MG clarified that he had asked MM to update on the NUS budget. Confirmed that it still exists, and that through MM and the PG Representatives this committee can have a say in how it is spent.

117 Time and Date of Next Meeting

- JM explained that provisionally the meeting is scheduled for the 9th of December.
- MG objected to this, requesting that it be moved forward a week.
- MP sought clarification as to whether organising a meeting during the strike would be perceived as crossing the picket line.
- JM commented that UCU would clarify what buildings striking individuals can and cannot enter during the strikes. And further stated that officers can join in the strike in solidarity with affected academics should they choose.
- MG provisionally scheduled meeting for the 2ND of December 2019.

Note: This meeting has been rearranged to the 3rd of December 2019 at 5:15pm

Action Log

Date Commissioned:	Action Required:	Assigned to:	Date to be actioned by:
12/11/19	To seek further advice in regard to merging the GCMG and PGC remits. Specifically in regard to staff protocol and the separation of political and management roles.	MM	03/12/19
12/11/19	Explore the possibility of submitting a funding request for activities to SOC.	LM, SA & MG	03/12/19
12/11/19	Continue the process of pressuring UEA Sport to fund PG activities and feedback accordingly.	AP & MM	03/12/19
12/11/19	To collate all the separate information around school and faculty funding for conferences.	MM	03/12/19
12/11/19	Add a question to the existing application about	JM & SAR	03/12/19

	who applicants are funded by.		
12/11/19	Add a notification that applications from students funded by a research council will automatically be brought to committee for discussion.	JM & SAR	03/12/19
	Discuss the possibility of reserving conference funding for certain groups of students.	MG, MM, AT & JM	03/12/19
12/11/19	To provide explanation of Big Shift Big Day through Teams	MM	03/12/19