



**CITY COMMUNITY SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING 1 – Friday 2nd October 2015
UNCONFIRMED MINUTES**

Name of Member	Meeting 1 02/10/15	Meeting 2 24/11/15	Meeting 3 25/01/16	Meeting 4 21/03/16	Meeting 5 03/05/16
SU President (Chair)	√				
Lorenzo Trapani (Co-Chair)	√				
SU Vice President Education	-				
SU Vice President Activities & Development	√				
Craig Stewart	A				
SU Student member	-				
SU Student member	-				
SU Student member	-				
SU Student member	-				
Rob Garden	√				
Melanie Bunce	√				
David Ross	A				
Grietje Baars	√				
Chris Smart	√				
Demetri Petrou	A				
Jason Clarke	-				
Bill Thompson	√				
Pam Parker	A				
Shereen Sally	√				
Mehrangez Rahman	√				
Ben Robinson	√				
Megan Butler (Secretary)	√				

√ indicates attendance

A indicates apologies have been provided

Attending: Chris Clements (Education & Student Strategy Coordinator); Maria Dingle (School of Health Sciences)

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed the group and led introductions.

Apologies were received and noted. Maria Dingle was in attendance on behalf of David Ross.

It was explained that previously the group had been named the Student Community Working Group, it had a number of student members and had focused on community issues for students. Priorities/projects previously considered by the group were free Wednesday afternoons for students, Friday prayers and the CityBuddies scheme. The group had been amended to tie with the Education and Student Strategy, City Communities hub.

2. Minutes

The minutes from Meeting 11 of the Student Community Working Group were approved.

3. Terms of Reference

The group reviewed the amended Terms of Reference for the group. It was explained that the Education and Student Strategy (E&SS) had been approved last year and five central themes had been identified, which formed the five hubs of the strategic plan. Each hub of the plan was assigned to a sub-committee and the sub-committees would take oversight and responsibility for the development of activities/projects that align with step-change activity of the hub. One of the E&SS hubs was 'City Communities' and this groups remit was recognised as focusing on this area of activity. Therefore, it was decided that the group's remit would be amended to take responsibility for the delivery of the hub and projects contributing to this.

It was highlighted that the group needed to determine their priorities and identify and agree projects for the coming year. Project proposals and priorities would need to be presented to E&SC in February 2016.

The group approved the proposed Terms of Reference for the group.

4. Priorities Update

The group considered that they should analyse what the University already does to develop a sense of community within the student body in order to get a clear picture of what is already happening and to locate good practice. It was highlighted that good practice from the APE process would be distributed to this group. The group agreed that feedback from students about what they want is very important and the group should analyse this in order to identify and develop projects.

The group discussed resources that were available to them for projects. It was highlighted that the groups remit fits into the E&SS and there was money linked to this. It was emphasised that the group needed to come up with strong and persuasive strategies for projects in order to secure funding.

5. Update on progress of step-change activities/projects contributing to the City Communities hub

It was acknowledged that currently the group did not have any step-change projects to receive updates on, but would do at future meetings.

6. Students' Union Exec/Liberation Report

It was explained that the SU had Liberation Officers to represent specific groups of students, who are traditionally underrepresented, or have specific issues that require representation. It was confirmed that reports would be provided at future meetings for consideration.

7. City Communities (student-led and university) project update

The group received an update on City Communities projects. The group were informed that a project was in development to gather information on the Universities students based on their values and behaviours. The project would be outsourced to a company called Redbrick who would do all the

research on the student body and classify students on their characteristics. It was highlighted that the research would mean in depth data/information on different groups of students could be shared and evaluated.

It was acknowledged that there were many different groups of students with different needs/demands, and the University and the group needed to understand the needs of the groups, rather than generalising the student body. It was suggested that SITS could be used as a tool for data on students, but it was highlighted that if SITS was solely used the information collected would be factual rather than focusing on student's personalities. It was explained that Redbrick would look at SITS data as part of their overall research, but would not just focus on data from this database. The group agreed that information gathering on students should be a priority for the group as this would be invaluable.

It was confirmed that the Redbrick data gathering project was a joint venue between the SU and the University, and funding would be shared.

The group were informed that the SU were looking into finding out where students live when they don't live in Halls of Residence. This research would mean that the SU could identify students living in the same area and encourage them to interact as a community outside of the University environment. The group were in agreement that this was a good idea and it would be worth exploring options of how to best proceed with this.

8. Set priorities for the 2015/16 year

The group discussed different priorities for the upcoming year. It was suggested that the group should make sure the University are aware of the sub-committees existence and ensure the groups developing projects are communicated across the University.

The group were in agreement that gathering information on students should be a priority and that work on the Redbrick project should move forward swiftly. It was explained that the Redbrick project had already been proposed to the SU Trustee Board and to Student & Academic Services and it was hoped that this could start in November in order to have the reports/results by February.

Action: Chair to circulate Redbrick proposal to the group

The group discussed the issue of equality. It was highlighted that in sport different groups of students were underrepresented and sport was not always a safe place for students to be. It was explained that CitySport had a zero tolerance policy on bullying/harassment and that all sports captains had to sign this, but work needed to be done on equality for students. It was highlighted that gender equality was also an important issue. It was acknowledged that there were lots of different student communities/groups (i.e LGBT and faith groups), but they did not always interact each other and it was suggested that work could be done on collaboration between different groups of students. The group agreed that the issue of equality should be viewed as a priority and projects in relation to this should be proposed/discussed.

It was highlighted that it would be important to improve communications to students in order to promote the student community and/or community events. It was acknowledged that different methods of communication needed to be looked at, as staff cannot send all student emails. The portal had been created for students to get information, but it was acknowledged that not all students viewed the portal regularly, so it may not be the best form of communication. It was suggested that Facebook was regularly viewed by students and the ExperienceCity website was now online and was attracting 2000 plus students per month, therefore both could be used for communication with students. It was highlighted that the Redbrick project would look at how best to communicate with City students. The group agreed that communication with students should be a priority.

The group discussed space at the University for students. It was highlighted that there was a lot of feedback in surveys about lack of space for students. It was acknowledged that there would be more student space in the Tait building when the SU and the Chaplaincy development is completed. It was highlighted that the furniture within the University made some spaces uninviting and some space was not utilised to its full potential. The group acknowledged that they needed to understand what students wanted from available space before making any proposals. The group agreed student space should be a priority.

It was agreed that commuter students and their needs should be a priority. It was agreed that the SU project of finding out where student commuters live in order to create communities outside the University should move forward.

The group discussed some short term goals that could be enacting during the year. The SU had been reviewing past SU campaigns and had collected historic posters advertising events. The SU planned to showcase the posters to students to improve University pride and further install a sense of community. It was suggested that alumni students could submit short stories about their time at City to tie in with the historic SU posters. It was highlighted that CitySport had a history sports wall and had tracked down past images and stories and it was suggested an empty wall within the University could be used to showcase the documentation. It was acknowledged that extra resources would be required as someone would need to gather and put together all the archived documents. The group agreed this City History project should be taken forward and implemented.

Action: Mehrangez Rahman to speak to Alumni team

9. Establish the measures of success for the group

It was suggested that the group could measure success from results of community sections on internal and external surveys (YV1&2, NSS), but it was highlighted that this would be a difficult measure as improvements in survey scores might not be seen for three years. The group agreed to track and measure success through updates at meetings.

10. Yearly Calendar

It was explained that there was a calendar of the cycle of business for the group, which detailed when certain reports and topics would be discussed by the group. It was highlighted this would be useful as other attendees could be invited to meetings if this would be beneficial for discussion. The yearly calendar would be presented and approved at the next meeting.

11. NSS report

It was confirmed that data was still being collated for this report and would be presented at the next meeting.

12. NUS research

It was confirmed this report would be presented at the next meeting.

13. AOB

It was highlighted that it was Black History month in October and the SU would be running various events for students to raise awareness of this.

Provisional Meetings in 2015/16:

24th November 2015, 15:30-17:00

25th January 2016, 15:00-16:30

21st March 2016, 15:00-16:30

3rd May 2016, 15:30-17:30

Megan Butler

Megan.butler@city.ac.uk

020 7040 4243

City Communities Sub-Committee: Actions and Matters Arising

	Date	Agenda Item	Item Title	Action Required	Member to actions	Action Due	Action status	Comments
1	02/10/15	8	Set priorities for the 2015/16 year	Circulate Redbrick proposal to the group	MR	24/11/15		
2	02/10/15	8	Set priorities for the 2015/16 year	Speak to Alumni team in regards to alumni stories	Chair (IC)	24/11/15		
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								