Summarisation of various matters discussed at BoT meetings

September 2016 - Shared Planet ("SP")

Whether, alongside Summer Gathering, to reintroduce something like Shared Planet. Eg could bring together objectives to promote the FanClub, increase networking among and between students and non-students.

In it's favour, a paper from 2011 showed we had recruited around 70 new FANClub members at Shared Planet in the past, so it was good for income generation. Anecdotally there was love expressed for SP at Summer Gathering this year [2016]. It also generated loyalty towards People & Planet. Shared Planet provided a means for students to get a sense of being part of something national, rather than just their local group.

Discussion:-   It's not in our new [2016-19] strategy to have a Shared Planet type event so not a priority. We had much higher levels of capacity across all teams when we were running Shared Planet before. We dropped Shared Planet in order to train more individual student groups.

Look at other orgs to collaborate with that might be natural fit with People & Planet (by age demographics) – including for a national event (resource allowing)?

Look at a national event as a way of supporting our strategic aims (when there is capacity to work towards it).

Regional events have been scaled up to fulfil some of the functions set out above. We are getting more focussed on building relationships with other networks eg black students and Islamic student groups.

November 2016 - Feedback and discussion on network democracy /reactive campaigns

Students' understanding of how P&P works – summary of discussions at Summer Gathering 2016

The vast majority of students consulted, at all 'levels of involvement' in the network, had a very limited understanding of People & Planet's organisational structure and the role and process of democracy within it. This included not knowing the board of trustees existed (and had student representation on), not knowing that the student trustee elections happened, confusion over where democratic decisions were made, and not knowing how *they* could make positive interventions in what P&P was working on.

Students felt that democratic structures and processes that do exist were not widely known or engaged in and that they were often informal, meaning that having high levels of social capital within the network and with staff afforded certain members disproportionate influence and decision making power.

Students suggested that we should create and publicise a page on the website mapping People & Planet's democracy and organisational structure with information on how to make interventions at different points for transparency and enhancing student engagement.

No minuted BoT decision on this matter.

There was feedback from the relevant session at Summer Gathering [2016] from students, who had together attended Summer Gatherings for the last 5 years, that they had never before been consulted/given so much decision making power over People & Planet process and that it was really positive that student trustees were facilitating that democracy in the network. Students recommended that this should become standard practice when introducing new processes and consulting with the network. Students suggested that the minutes of Board meetings should be made available online and circulated to members of the network.

BoT decision:-
BoT felt it would **not** be appropriate to publish the **whole** of the BoT minutes on the website. Need to ensure BoT meetings are a space where BoT members can feel free to be open and honest about matters that can be confidential or sensitive for various reasons. Whenever BoT makes a decision, it will also decide if and how that decision is to be published to the network (usually this will be in a document and associated papers - via the website - rather than by publication of the full minutes and papers).

Reactive Campaigns – summary of discussions at Summer Gathering 2016

[NB no staffing or other resources have yet been identified or allocated to taking forward the suggestions below]

Students were asked to imagine there was a proposal for a reactive campaign in response to Brexit, to challenge the rising racism that it legitimised, and to answer 5 questions around how the network should consider the proposal:

1. How should a student or group make a proposal?
2. How should the proposal be presented to the network?
3. How would members of the network discuss and develop the proposal?
4. How would the network decide whether to adopt the proposed campaign?
5. How should the network decide when to end the campaign?

Drawing on the discussions had by students in response to this, and the consensus decisions made [at Summer Gathering], below is a proposed model for dealing with reactive campaign proposals.

- Proposals for reactive campaigns to be adopted by the network, and supported by People & Planet staff, must be submitted to a member of staff by a member of the network on behalf of a group within the network.
  - The proposal must have been discussed, refined and agreed upon by the local group before submission.
  - Staff should support local groups in this process of decision making and discussion.
- Submitted proposals should be made available to the network by centrally uploading them to the People & Planet website, and by circulating them to key contacts at local groups who should then disseminate the proposal to group members.
- The circulated proposal should come with a 'reality check' from staff – information around the availability of resources, the likelihood of successfully funding the campaign, the feasibility of the campaign, and the capacity of staff to run it.
- Proposals should be discussed at local groups, and each group should agree on its position on the campaign (e.g. support, desire to run the campaign, acquiescence, desire to block the campaign from being run).
- This position, as well as any key points raised at the local discussions should be fed into a network-wide feed-in, on a platform like Loomio/Slack, where delegates/key contacts from

each group report back on behalf of their whole group.

- Delegates from local groups use the information gathered in the network-wide feed-in to decide whether the campaign should run depending on whether there is enough willingness to run the campaign across the network, and the level of 'blocking'/disagreement with the idea of the network running the campaign at all.
- When the campaign is planned, it should be given a time limit (e.g. 6 months) retaining the option to extend the campaign at pre-set review dates.
- It should be SMART-targeted so that the campaign would automatically end if the time elapses (and is not extended) or the targets are met.

Below are the consensus decisions made at the Summer Gathering [2016] session:

- Proposals should have to come from a whole local group (rather than an individual member of the network), whatever its size.
- The discussion takes place at the level of local groups (e.g. each proposes a decision and response, rather than a barrage of individual points online from members).
- Campaigns should be time limited, retaining the option to extend the campaign at pre-determined review dates, and SMART-targeted so that the campaign would automatically end if the time elapses (and it is not extended) or the targets are met.

No minuted BoT decision on this matter.