

Imperial College Union
Minutes of Services and Sustainability Board
25th February 2021 – 6:00pm – 7.30pm

Minutes of meeting of 28th January 2021

Present

Role	Name
Deputy President (Finance and Services)	Sam Lee (Chair) (SL)
Arts and Entertainment Sector Chair	India Marsden (IM)
Council Representative	Michael Kohn (MK)
Ethics & the Environment Welfare Officer	Danielle Gimbosh (DG)
KNE Environmental President	Petchara Newson (PC)
Ethics & Environment Officer	Chin Stephanie Yeung (CY)
Ethics & the Environment Community Engagement Officer	Jumana Ibrahim SalahEldin Mohamed (JM)
Ethics & the Environment Campaigns Officer	Neha Yasin (NY)
DramSoc Representative	Ellen Redgrave (ER)
Bar Representative	Niamh McAuley (NA)
Knowledge Sector Vice-Chair (Careers)	Gordan Yat Cheung (GC)

Observers:

Governance Officer	Victoria Agbontaen (VA)
--------------------	-------------------------

Item	Actions
1. Chair's welcome and Introductions 1.1. Chair welcomed members of SSB to the first 2020-21 meeting and gave an overview of the new format that SSB will be operating in this year.	
2. Apologies: N/A	
3. Minutes of Previous Meeting Confirmed	
4. Matters Arising/Action Tracker N/A	
Regular Updates	
5. DPFS Update 5.1. SL gave a brief overview of the DPFS report that was presented to Council in January, outlining his objectives. 5.2. SL noted that many of the changes to the job description are due to the fact that the DPFS has its role written into the byelaws that should not sit with the DPFS but with Senior Finance roles.	
6. Commercial Update 6.1. SL noted that due to government guidance, we have had to close down all our Commercial services until further notice. 6.2. SL expressed that at the end of February there should be more insight as to when our Commercial services will resume. 6.3. SL highlighted that the Director of Finance and Resources that was recruited in December 2020 has started a phased induction and SL will be having regular catch-ups to refine the commercial services going forward.	
7. UCH Redev Update 7.1. UCU Redev project has not progressed much since the last update but SL thought it would be in the interest of SSB to know what is expected of the redev project, this was attached as part of the paper. 7.2. SL noted that the proposal had been agreed by CHUG and a discussion has been had around time-pressures of completing by Easter. Due to lack of response from College in certain areas as well as College not having a master key to the Union building. 7.3. SL added that it is unlikely that this project will be completed this academic year. However, CHUG approved that sentiment that either ne funds should be allocated to complete further extensive work or more time should be spent on focusing and refining the project as opposed to rushing to completion for this academic year.	
8. SRI Update 8.1. SL noted that this will be discussed during AOB.	
Substantive Items	
9. User Groups 9.1. SL questioned SSB on User Groups and asked them to consider where the line should be dawn with User groups, i.e., specialist groups.	

<p>9.2. IM agreed that it should just be specialist spaces but that it should be made clear to student's what forums they can go to if they have queries about other spaces as it currently is not.</p> <p>9.3. IM added that CSPB would be the logical place for students to come to and express concerns about how other societies who did not have user groups would be using spaces as opposed to SSB as SSB does not have enough society representation from the variety of societies for it to be a reasonable place to report.</p> <p>9.4. SL questioned how User Groups should be solely for CSPs or whether it should function with input from other areas including Liberation Networks and Union events.</p> <p>9.5. SL said that there is a need to be cognisant of isolating other Students groups ability to use various spaces. Expressing that the process needs to suit the needs of all students.</p> <p>9.6. SL expressed that this does not necessarily have to fit in with a sub-committee of Council and could simply feedback to the DPFS and DPCS or Leadership.</p> <p>9.7. MK expressed he felt there should be someone with oversight who is not a Sabbatical Officer as it would cause higher workloads for them. SL agreed, stating that one of the Student Opportunities and Development Co-ordinators could take responsibility for this.</p> <p>9.8. IM suggested putting together a working group of DPFS, DPCS and any User Groups Chairs that could also have representatives of SSB and CSPB if necessary which would form a User Group Board.</p> <p>9.9. SL agreed but stated that we do not want to over-inflate our democratic structures as majority of students are volunteers with limited extra time. NM suggested that it would be best to ask the societies if they want this before it is brought back to discuss with SSB again.</p> <p>9.10. SL said that a student Board should not be responsible for maintenance, but they should have oversight. SL questioned SSB, asking whether the Union should be financially responsible for all maintenance or if it something College should be giving us.</p> <p>9.11. SL noted that as a Union, we cannot be restrictive over who can use what space at what time and all societies should have equal opportunities and access to space. MK highlighted that although CSP's might have priority over non-affiliated groups, if students want to use a specific space and it's available, they should be able to do so.</p>	
<p>10. Sponsorship Policy</p> <p>10.1. SL noted that the policy had slightly changed since circulation with differences to layout and a point in the limitations.</p> <p>10.2. SL explained that this policy is here to formalise current processes that are not changing (excluding minor changes including who can sign off the contracts), templates used, process of approval and sign off.</p> <p>10.3. This gives the Union an opportunity to expand the number of people who can sign off and authorise this process and it is solely the DPFS who can currently do this.</p>	

<p>10.4. SL noted that there are not any limitations. Financially, Finance and Risk and the Board of Trustees reserve the right to reject a sponsorship contract if it is believed to bring the CSP or Union into disrepute, harm the values of the organisation or risking the loss of funds due to sponsorship contracts.</p> <p>10.5. SL highlighted that in other SU's, limitations tend to be arms dealers, oil and gas industry partners etc. However, ICU does not have an issue getting sponsorships from these partners for now.</p> <p>10.6. SL added that the contracts will be forwarded to the activities inbox, which will be sorted into tier 1 and tier 2 contracts as outlined in the paper. Highlighting that the policy will be reviewed on an annual basis by SSB and CSPB before it goes to Finance and Risk.</p>	
<p>11. Allergies</p> <p>11.1. MK gave an overview of his paper highlighting that the majority of restaurants in College do not have clear oversight of allergies/intolerance for students.</p> <p>11.2. MK added that it is the law for packaged foods to outline the 14 allergens and not all restaurants are following this, and pressure should be put on College services to label these food items and encouraging intolerance and allergens training for staff.</p> <p>11.3. MK expressed that the 568 should do more to stock long-life alternatives for students to offer an equivalent to cater for all students.</p> <p>11.4. NM fully supported the paper, specifying that it can be a hassle for students to find things to eat on campus as there are not many packaged, gluten-free options available.</p> <p>11.5. NM added that in terms of 568, the work in the kitchens was done to ensure it was abiding by safety rules and was not a complete refurbishment and the reason the allergen information has been taken off the menu is because the kitchen is too small to provide these food items and non-cross-contamination of allergens cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>11.6. MK expressed that there has been a trend by the College to take things that can cater for everyone and replace them with things that cannot and more should be done to ensure there are options for students.</p> <p>11.7. SL suggested to modify point 3 of the Union resolves to read, 'where possible and where not possible, it must be detailed as to why' but agreed that the rest of the paper is valid and will be addressed with College. MK agreed to the changes.</p> <p>11.8. SY agreed with the paper, explaining that she has allergens that come and go. SY said the first resolve is very important and it should be ensured that all staff on duty are aware of allergens in the food. SY expressed that she does not eat on Campus as staff cannot confidently explain what potential allergens are in food products.</p> <p>11.9. NM asked whether an allergen survey has ever been done by the Union to see how many people have allergens which will help to be used as a pressure point for College to make the necessary change. MK said he would be happy to support with setting up this survey if it we agree to do that.</p>	<p>SL to update SBB on College discussions regarding allergens paper and confirm whether a allergens survey is needed for students.</p> <p>SL to check and confirm if the Union has ever carried out an allergen survey with students.</p>

<p>11.10. Allergen paper was passed by consensus.</p>	
<p>12. Values Workshop</p> <p>12.1. SL explained that the Union is currently undergoing a strategic plan review and as part of this, key student volunteers and stakeholders will be involved in the process of what the values of the organisation should be going forwards.</p> <p>12.2. SL highlighted that this strategic plan will be in place for the next two years and this is a pivotal turning point for the Union and a lot of progress and change will be involved.</p> <p>12.3. SL added that it is key for the Union to have input from everyone to help shape the values. SL subsequently went through a slide explaining what values are and what the current organisational values of the Union are.</p> <p>12.4. SL explained that the purpose of the session was for SSB to gather 3-5 words that summarise our collective values.</p> <p>12.5. The top 6 values chosen were: Community, Openness, Compassion, Transparency, Empathy and Integrity.</p>	
<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>SL stated that College are to do some work on sustainability, especially within its catering outlets and they are currently proposing by next academic year that they will remove beef from all College owned catering outlets, retail range and introduce meat free Mondays in all catering outlets.</p> <p>SL added that by March 2022 College want to remove beef from all hospitality menus, venue menus and only organic milk, free range and organic eggs will be sold. Additionally, delivery days will be reduced from seven to three.</p> <p>MK explained that regarding the previous introduction of meat free Monday, people took issue with the fact that it felt like it had come out of no where with little to no student input. NM agreed that the student dissatisfaction was partially due to lack of advertisement.</p> <p>MK said that he does not understand why College would delay this change for two years when they are already taking the steps to make these changes. SL explained that this may be due to current contractual obligations.</p> <p>IM expressed that she felt it was a good time to introduce meat free Mondays as several students have been off campus for so long as well as there being a lot of new students so it is likely there will not be as much of a backlash as there previously was.</p> <p>IM questioned whether the College have carried out surveys to find confirm what would be the best focus of sustainability rather than trying to be in line with what other universities may be doing. NM felt that switching to organic sources should be a priority over getting rid of all beef.</p> <p>NY agreed that she would like to see the reintroduction of meat free Mondays but was worried that if there was an immediate increase of costs, the students will immediately see it as a negative thing. NY said that the College need to consider if their switch to organic products is sustainable and worth the extra cost students will be paying. NM agreed that the rise in prices is not going to make students more receptive to the changes.</p> <p>DG questioned why specifically only beef is being removed from all of the outlet menus whereas they are still selling other meats such as pork and chicken. DG did not agree with the idea of meat free Mondays as it should students should not be forced to not be meat-eaters.</p>	<p>Provide update regarding the work on food sustainability changes at College following feedback from SSB.</p>

GY agrees with the fact that organic products are very unstandardised and can be more harmful to the environment. However, GY said that if the organic aspect is more sustainable he is unsure why it is not introduced in the first phase. GY suggested that it is possible to use economic incentives, such as increasing the price of the meat options to subsidise the organic options.

GY added that removing only beef may cause more dissatisfaction than removing all meats at once for cultural reasons. SL said that it is likely College have done little student consultation on this and are making up their own assumptions.

PN said that a lot of students do not understand the difficulty of finding food on campus if you are a vegetarian so advertising meat free Monday's does not take away your options as a meat-eater.

NM stated that the focus should be on having more and better vegetarian and vegan options completely, rather just focusing on one day that is meat free as it is not useful if more options are not being introduced.