

MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS

The fifth ordinary meeting of the Council for the 2018/19 session, to be held on Tuesday 22 January in RSM G01, at 18:30.

**Present**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Role | Yes/No |
| Alistair Ludley | Academic Chair (ICSMSU) | N |
| Adrian Lamoury | Natural Sciences - Undergraduate |  |
| Aisha Chaudry | WELFARE OFFICER (ICSMSU) |  |
| Alejandro Luy | DEPUTY PRESIDENT (EDUCATION) |  |
| Alex Chippy Compton | Council Chair |  |
| Amy Tall | ACADEMIC LIASION OFFICER (RSM) |  |
| Andrew Hill | CGCU PRESIDENT |  |
| Ansh Bhatnagar | Natural Sciences - Undergraduate |  |
| Charlotte Griaud | Environmental Officer |  |
| Chimdi Igwe | CT CHAIR |  |
| Chloe Lewis | WELFARE OFFICER (RSM) |  |
| Claudia Caravello | DEPUTY PRESIDENT (FINANCE & SERVICES) |  |
| ~~Danai Paidousi~~ | ~~Engineering - Postgraduate~~ |  |
| Daniel Faehndrich | ICSMSU PRESIDENT | N |
| Daniel Wigh | KN CHAIR |  |
| David Tyoember | BME Officer | N |
| Deraj Wilson-Aggarwal | SILWOOD PRESIDENT | N |
| Hilary Guite | Non-Faculty |  |
| Hoi-Ming Yau | C&F CHAIR |  |
| Iman Ahmadi Moghaddam | Natural Sciences - Undergraduate |  |
| Jack Hall | Medicine - Undergraduate |  |
| James Medler | DEPUTY PRESIDENT (CLUBS & SOCIETIES) |  |
| Jehna Devraj | LGBT+ Officer |  |
| Joel Bilsdorfer | Vice President Education (CGCU) |  |
| Joseph O'Connell-Danes | A&E CHAIR |  |
| Laura Chen | International Officer |  |
| Lloyd James | Natural Sciences - Postgraduate |  |
| Marta Wolinska | RSM PRESIDENT |  |
| Mary Thi | Natural Sciences - Postgraduate |  |
| Maurice Yap | Engineering - Undergraduate |  |
| Michael McGill | RCSU PRESIDENT |  |
| Michaela Flegrova | RCSU VICE PRESIDENT (EDUCATION) |  |
| Milia Hasbani | Engineering - Postgraduate | N |
| Miroslav Gasparek | Engineering - Undergraduate |  |
| Ottilie Liu | Gender Equality Officer |  |
| Owen Heaney | Engineering - Undergraduate |  |
| Becky Neil | DEPUTY PRESIDENT (WELFARE) |  |
| Robert Tomkies | UNION PRESIDENT |  |
| ~~Ross Hunter~~ | ~~Vice President Wellbeing (CGCU)~~ |  |
| Salma El-Gharby | Interfaith Officer |  |
| Sam Haselgrove | Disabilities Officer |  |
| Sarah Sayers | Medicine - Postgraduate |  |
| Shervin Sabeghi | WELFARE OFFICER (RCSU) |  |
| Simran Kukran | Engineering - Undergraduate |  |
| Tasneem Mahmud | Mental Health Officer |  |
| Raya El Laham | Welfare (GSU) |  |
| Jenny Kim | Academic (GSU) |  |
| TBC | Welfare (Silwood) |  |
| TBC | Academic (Silwood) |  |
| Thomas Fernandez Debets | Sports Sector Chair |  |
| Thomas Pleece | RE CHAIR |  |
| Ute Thiermann | GSU PRESIDENT |  |
| Waseem Hasan | Medicine - Undergraduate |  |
| Zixiao Wang | Engineering - Postgraduate |  |
| Ashely Brooks | GSU Deputy President (A+W) |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Observer |

**Apologies**

|  |
| --- |
| Alistair Ludley |
| David Tyoember |
| Milia Hasbani |
| Deraj Wilson-Aggarwal |
| Daniel Faehndrich |

**Minutes**

Abbreviations/Acronyms that may not be common and are used in this document are:

CU = Constituent Union

OT = Officer Trustee

PG = Postgraduate

UG = Undergraduate

U/C = Union Council

SABBs = Sabbatical Officers

MRes = Master of Research

SK = South Kensington

CSPB = Clubs, Societies, Projects and Boards

VP = Vice President

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item 1- Chairs business**  **Item 2**  **Item 3** | **The Chair welcomed the Committee to the fifth ordinary meeting of the Council for the 2018/19 session.**   1. The minutes for 13 November U/C were accepted by a show of hands 2. There was a comment received via email for Item 13 in the minutes for December U/C to be changed from ‘Student Choice Awards’ to Student Academic Choice Awards’ 3. There was a comment received for the minutes for 11 December U/C to make note that the Council Chair was absent, therefore, Owen Heaney, chaired that particular meeting 4. The minutes for 11 December U/C were accepted by a show of hand 5. There was a reminder for individuals who have an action on the ‘Action Tracker’ to send their updates via email to save time to get through the items on the agenda for this meeting |
| **Item 4** | The paper was presented by Daniel Wigh  **Discussion overview:**   1. Described the paper 2. The presenter reiterated that although the Union has rules; this paper was to formalise the rules on cheating at the Union   **Question/Comment**   1. A question was asked if there was a qualification on what is ‘cheating’   **Response**   1. It was explained that there is already a policy on what qualifies as ‘cheating’   **Resolved:** To Accept the DPW Report – **PASSED**  Accept: 97% Rejected: 3 % |
| **Item 5** | The paper was presented by James Medler  **Discussion overview:**   1. The paper was presented via presentation format in order to make the paper easier to understand 2. The presenter offered background, structure/governance, membership/pricing and a summary 3. The presenter asked for a show of hands on who has heard of ‘Sports hubs’   **Question/Comment**   1. There was a question on how to avoid duplication of work from CSPB and sports committee 2. It was noted that from a sports sector point of view that was is to be put in place is a very good change 3. There was a question to ask how the college will respond and if they will get more money for sports   **Response**   1. It was mentioned to reduce the duplication of work from CSPB and the sports committee, once a term there would be a meet up between CSPB and the sports committee in order to have a good formal channel of communication between the two 2. It was stated that the college has been fully involved and the financial support has already been agreed   **Resolved:** To Accept the DPW Report – **PASSED**  Accept:94% Abstain: 6 % |
| **Item 6** | The paper was presented by Rob Tomkies  **Discussion overview:**   1. The paper was described 2. There was an explanation on the mapping project when doing role reviews 3. It was stated that some key areas that were lacking, included:    1. Camp services    2. Colleges strategic finances   **Question/Comment**   1. There seemed to be a clear confusion to the purpose of the name changes because the strategic role of the DPCS seemed to fit under the umbrella of clubs and societies 2. There seemed to be confusion with student development since there is already a development team 3. It was suggested that the name change ‘activities and societies' could be better encompassing 4. People were informed that they were used to the name, hence, the name change to development was confusing 5. There was an offer to keep the remit, but not to change the name to DPCS 6. It was empahsised that the Union was generally confusing, thus, these name changes just added to the communication issues that was already present at the Union 7. There was particularly no purpose of name changes as the changes seemed very similar 8. It was suggested that in the long term the change seemed to allow clubs to think about where they are going with an enquiry, although, it’s confusing in the short term 9. There was an enquire if there was a new member of staff to take over from the responsibilities left over from DPCS role 10. It was encouraged that the name changes had been discussed with members in the roles, hence, there is experience regarding wanting the change   **Response**   1. It was explained that the name change to the DPCS role was to encompass the affects it has to activities overall. Hence, it seemed important for that to be explained when students run for the role. 2. There was emphasis that that the name changes to DPCS role is not confusing because there was an activities staff team that worked at the Union, therefore, if students had issues related to activities, they have the option to contact that department 3. It was stated that although this name change would have ‘development’ within its title it is not connected with the development team; although there will be emphasis of development within this role given the name change. 4. It was agreed that the paper prosper was happy to vote on keeping the remit and the name changes of DPCS as two separate resolves 5. It was explained that new staff members to take on any further responsibilities was down to budgets and needed to be discussed 6. It was mentioned that marketing and communication was key to the implementation, so students are not confused with these name changes and the purpose of the role   **Resolved:** To Accept – **Accept**  Resolve one: Accept:47%Reject: 39 Abstain: 14%  Resolve two: 100  Resolve three: 100 |
| **Item 7** | The paper was presented by Becky Neil  **Discussion overview:**   1. The paper was described   **Question/Comment**   1. There was no reference to the college in the amendment/paper 2. There was an amendment proposed to add ‘working with both the college and Union staff’ in 23.2. to read Co-ordinate the campaigns within their remit, working with College and Union staff, students identifying in their remit, allies and elected student volunteers taking into account the involvement of students based at non-South Kensington campuses and adjusting plans accordingly. - ACCEPTED   **Resolved:** To Accept the paper– **PASSED**  Accept: 97**%** Rejected 0% Abstain 3% |
| **Item 8** | The paper was presented by Martha Wolkinson  **Discussion overview:**   1. The paper was described   **Question/Comment**   1. There was an amendment proposed on 12. Vii to change to Oversee the activities of the Welfare Events Coordinator and Departmental Wellbeing Representatives 2. There was an amendment proposed on 15. IV to say Promote the welfare services provided by Imperial College, the ICU and the Faculty of Engineering 3. A comment was a received to explain that members were glad to see the change of emphasis and the work done at RSMU   **Resolved:** To Accept the paper– **PASSED**  Accept: 97**%** Rejected 0% Abstain 3% |
| **Item 9** | The paper was presented by Ute Theirmann  **Discussion overview:**   1. The paper was described   **Question/Comment**   1. There was confusion regarding an issue/ overlap with running as officer at White City officer GCSU and not running for volunteering for undergraduate committees at White City 2. There was an ask if there was a career office because most students are looking for a job when they finish their studies. Finding a job was explained as most important 3. It was mentioned that the business school comes under non faculty role, therefore, it was offered that4.16/ 4.17 should be amended to say non faculty 4. It was stated that the VP operations seemed different to what people are used to 5. There was an ask if the change from 15 volunteers to 28 would keep people represented effectively   **Response**   1. It was suggested that the entertainment and events officers can be a part of the remit of ‘careers’ but it was kept broad in the paper 2. There was an emphasis for partnership working e.g. White City officer GCSU and not running for volunteering for undergraduate committees at White City 3. The amendment 12.4.1 should say ‘through’ instead of ‘though’ 4. It was said that this paper is supposed to be a separate channel to Silwood if students needed support   **Action**   1. The union president agreed to take on the ‘non faculty’ business concerns   **Resolved:** To Accept the paper– **PASSED**  Accept: 74**%** Rejected 14% Abstain 11% |
| **Item 10** | The paper was presented by Owen Heanley  **Discussion overview:**   1. The paper was described 2. It was explained that there was not time for this constituent union to write the descriptions of their new roles due to having limited time to write the paper. However, they encouraged members to pass this paper for the sake of further delay 3. It was noted that the president's job as it stood was not manageable, hence there was purpose to make some changes   **Question/Comment**   1. It was emphasised that it was difficult to make an informed decision on the paper with the amount of information that was lacking 2. It was explained that there was a restructure of CGCU last year, thus, it was difficult to comprehend why there needed to be further changes made to the constitution` 3. It was citied at 6.2.1 of the paper it was unclear who was responsible 4. There was a suggestion to expand on the role of a president and the VP as it didn’t seem clear 5. It was stated that there needed to be further clarity on the purpose of renaming the Chair to VP 6. It was mentioned that it seemed confusing to remove five VPs and replace them with one VP with the same level in the role. It was suggested that it seemed to give a reduced impression when people are running for the role 7. It was noted that there is a principle of self-determination, thus, U/C shouldn’t be apposing relatively small changes to the CGCU because it sends a back president that U/C are micromanaging CUs 8. It was encouraged that the best strategy was to have guidelines on the roles before agreeing on ‘titles’   **Response**   1. It was suggested that it could appear that the Union was micro managing CUs if the paper was not accepted despite the committee agreeing to the changes 2. It was explained that the removal of VPs and replacing them with one VP on the same level in the role was done so VPs could manage the chairs; thus, it removed the management & day to day responsibilities away from the president. As a result, the president could participate in external strategic matters 3. It was stated that the guideline on the description of the role was discussed in the CGCU committee meeting. Nevertheless, rather regrettably there wasn't time to write about the changes in order for it to be presented in the paper brought to Council 4. It was mentioned that the changes offered to further change the CGCU constitution wasn’t a complete restructure. It was acknowledged that there was a complete restructure last year, regardless, the committee found problems with the way the structure currently stood   **Resolved:** To Accept the paper– **PASSED**  Accept:56% Rejected 15% Abstain 29% |
| **Item 11** | The paper was presented by Jack Hall on behalf of the ICMSU president  **Discussion overview:**   1. A short message was read on behalf of the ICMSU president who was absent from this meeting   **Question/Comment**   1. It was mentioned that this paper was very important to support as a non-medical student 2. It was said that the context of this paper seems to be current across the country, consequently, UC members should stand in support too   **Resolved:** To Accept the DPW Report – **PASSED**  Accept:88% Rejected 0% Abstain 12% |
| **Item 12** | The paper was presented by Becky Neil  **Discussion overview:**   1. Explained the purpose of the sexual misconduct working group, particularly the sanction of seven years that was mentioned in the paper that was previously brought to Council. It was highlighted that the seven-year time limit was not what other Unions were doing thus, there was a proposal to remove this 2. It was also asked to dissolve the sexual misconduct working group so the members in it could run a campaign about tackling the function of the crown prosecution service. Consequently, there was an ask if anyone wanted to be involved in the campaign for the crown prosecution service 3. It was mentioned that when voting on this paper members should be mindful that there needed to be a two- third majority because it was an effect that would change the bye-laws   Accept: 97% Rejected 3% |
| **Item 13** | The paper was presented by Deputy President (EDUCATION)  **Discussion overview:**   1. The paper was described 2. An apology was offered because the report had not changed substantially compared to the last report 3. The loss of staff members in the Education and Welfare department was mentioned and members were encouraged that the recruitment process for two members of staff was on the way 4. It was explained that work was being priortised for the Student Choice Awards and the Leadership Elections 5. The context of the DPE’s choice in clothing to the meeting was explained. The green suit was said to have been connected to the SACAs and to illustrate that the SACAs were open. 6. There was an ask for members to help name the character in the green suit that the DPE was dressed as because it was explained the choice of dressing was a social media campaign for the ceremony 7. The importance of metric for SACAs was explained and it was disclosed that the metrics would be ‘number of staff nominated’ as a goal for this year 8. There was an ask for the support of members to nominate in order to reach the goal mentioned and to help excellence   **Resolved:** To Accept the DPE Report – **PASSED**  Accept: 97% Rejected 0% Abstain 3% |
| **Item 14** | The paper was presented by Deputy President Welfare  **Discussion overview:**   1. The paper was described as tabled 2. Mentioned event 3. Stated where the money was going, those mentioned being: careers, your ‘OPs’ and electives   **Question/Comment**   1. A query was received to how the bursary 2015 emerged after so long after the conversation was submitted 2. There was a concern that the paper makes it seem like there are still things to do 3. It was suggested that year ‘opps’ are not open to allowing this funded year opportunity as a non-registered student, so there needs to be an exception 4. There was a concern to how the bursary would benefit the 2015 cohort 5. There was also clarity needed to know if the opportunity was being communicated to students who couldn’t afford this opportunity previously 6. There was an acknowledgment of the amount of work done on for this bursary to emerge, but students who were affected are leaving or will be leaving soon wasn’t fair. And it seemed like College almost waited for that cohort to complete their degree, as there seemed to be no real reason to why the money had only been accepted this year   **Response**   1. There was an explanation on the bursary 2015 then 2016 when the money changed and then shifted 2. It was stated that the provost board agrees that it is unfair to giving money on a case by case basis and were interested in having more ideas. 3. Members were informed that when this perspective was agreed it was then sent back to the provost board again. The money was then agreed, and the amount was duplicated. 4. It was stated that an email was going out to all student and then another email particularly for students affected, to communicate that the bursary was available   **Resolved:** To Accept the DPW Report – **PASSED**  Accept:88% Rejected 3% Abstain 9% |
| **Item 15** | The paper was presented by Deputy President and Finances  **Discussion overview:**   1. The paper was described as tabled   **Question/Comment**   1. I was suggested that to make changes and represent needs, people needed to know what’s possible in regard to budgets because it seemed hard to have impact without knowing what’s in the budgets 2. There was also an ask if budgets could be a part of the training at the Union as part of the student experience 3. There was a question on what was happening with breakfast and there was a request for an update 4. It was mentioned that finance reports happened annually and explained that the DPF is currently doing research to be clear on what's happening 5. There was a request from members for the finance report   **Action**   1. The DPF would email council to inform members when board was happening   **Resolved:** To Accept the DPW Report – **PASSED**  Accept: **88% Rejected 0% Abstain 12%** |
| **Item 16** | The paper was presented by **Deputy President Clubs and Societies**  **Discussion overview:**   1. The paper was described   **Resolved:** To Accept the DPW Report – **PASSED**  Accept: **94% Rejected 0% Abstain 6%** |
| **Item 17** | The paper was presented by Union President  **Discussion Overview:**   1. Encouraged more talk to be produced as Imperial approach the elections 2. Emphasised the importance for members to read the papers   **Response**   1. Mentioned the petition system as ongoing and systems is doing this work and has asked for updates to be produced at Council meetings   **Action**   1. To update Council concerning the petition system   **Resolved:** To Accept the Union President Report – **PASSED**  Accept:94% Rejected 3% Abstain 3% |
| **AOB** | 1. The Council chair informed members that a Council report was not produced due to being ill, therefore the council chair was absent from the board meeting 2. The Council encouraged members interested in the outcome of the board meeting to read the minutes |
| **Chair** | **Meeting closed.** |

**Minutes: Harriet Williams, Democracy Coordinator**