

Imperial College Union
Union Council / 8 March 2022
6:30pm / Union Dining Hall

Council Representative (UG Medicine)	Aigun Gassanova (AG)	Present
Silwood Chair	Alex Auyang (AA)	Present
Council Representative (PG Science)	Ang Li (AL)	Present
Postgraduate Taught AWO (Medicine)	Anjola Onifade (AO)	Absent
International Officer	Anvesh Rajeshirke (AR)	Present
RCSU President	Aparna Pillai (AP)	Present
Postgraduate Research AWO (Medicine)	Aryan Niknam Maleki (ANM)	Apologies
CGCU (Wellbeing Officer)	Aurna Maitra (AM)	Present
Disabilities Officer	Awais Seyyad (AS)	Present
Sports Sector Chair	Beckett Marshall (BM)	Absent
LGBTQ+ Officer	Calyste Revel (CR)	Present
Ethics and Environment Officer	Camilla Billari (CBI)	Present
Postgraduate Research AWO (Natural Sciences)	Ceire Wincott (CW)	Absent
Mental Health Officer	Charlotte Barot (CB)	Absent
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Christina Wang (CWA)	Apologies
Council Representative (UG Science)	Ding Ding (DD)	Apologies
Council Representative (PG Medicine)	Eman Adair Adair (EA)	Present
RSM Vice President Welfare	Emily Li (EL)	Present
Interfaith Officer	Seat lost under Byelaw A3.1	N/A
RSM Vice President Education	George Morgan (GM)	Present
Working Class Officer	Grace Fisher (GF)	Present
CGCU President	Hayley Wong (HW)	Present
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Hilliam Tung (HT)	Present
Deputy President (Clubs & Societies)	India Marsden (IM)	Apologies
CGCU (Education Chair)	James White (JW)	Present
RSM President	Jasmine Crocker (JC)	Present
Postgraduate Taught AWO (Business)	Jenaifer Farhad Sethna (JFS)	Absent
ICSMSU Academic Chair	Julia Komor (JK)	Apologies
Postgraduate Taught AWO (Engineering)	Christabel Ofori-Atta	Present
Council Representative (PG Engineering)	Lintong Li (LL)	Present
Union President	Lloyd James (LJ)	Present
ICSMSU Welfare Officer	Camellia Richards (CR)	Absent
Gender Equality Officer	Malinda Davies (MD)	Apologies

Postgraduate Taught AWO (Natural Sciences)	Manasa Reddy Sanaga (MRS)	Apologies
Knowledge Chair	Matthew Hamer (MH)	Present
Council Chair	Michaela Flegrova (MF)	Present
Council Representative (PG Business)	Molly Gao (MG)	Present
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Nabeel Azuhar Mohammed (NAM)	Present
Deputy President (Welfare)	Nathalie Podder (NP)	Present
A&E Chair	Niamh McAuley (NM)	Present
RCSU Vice President (Education)	Nicolas Barykin Pankevich (NBP)	Absent
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Rea Tresa (RT)	Present
Black & Minority Ethnic Students Officer	Rebekah Christie (RC)	Apologies
Deputy President (Finance & Services)	Sam Lee (SL)	Apologies
ICSMSU President	Samuel Hammond (SH)	Apologies
Council Representative (UG Science)	Stefano Fiocca (SF)	Present
RCSU Vice President (Welfare)	Tianyu Wen (TW)	Absent
Postgraduate Research AWO (Engineering)	Tin Hang Un (THU)	Present
Deputy President (Education)	Daniel Lo (DL)	Present
Council Representative (PG Engineering)	Yusen Wang (YW)	Absent
Council Representative (PG Business)	Zhun Tang (ZT)	Present

In attendance:

Cat Turhan (CT) – ICU Representation & Advice Manager

Helena Schofield (HS) – ICU Representation Coordinator

Dipto Basu (DB) – ICU Research & Policy Officer

Clem Jones (CJ) – ICU Governance & Democracy Coordinator

Samuel Lovatt (SLo) – Felix Editor

Susan Rutter (SR) - RCSU Treasurer

Trinity Stenhouse (TS) - RCSU Vice President (Operations)

Marina Moncayola Lobato (MML) – PG Business student

Sneha Rose Kuruvilla (SRK) – PG Business student

Matthew Okenyi (MO) – PG Engineering student

Standing Items

1. Welcome

MF welcomed everyone to the first in-person meeting of 2022. MF noted the new seating arrangement to facilitate the attendance of visitors and better hearing in the space.

2. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were noted as above.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Approved as an accurate record of proceedings by consensus.

4. Matters Arising (Action Tracker)

4.1 Meeting with Facilities, Health & Safety Manager to Discuss Cheerleading Training:

Action carried forward as awaiting update from SL.

4.2 Interdepartmental Coordination on Shared Modules:

DL reported that he has mentioned this to FoNS staff but they are not getting back on this issue and so he will prompt them for follow-up in regular scheduled catch-ups. With reference to FoE, DL reported that this has been dealt with by the education officer, HoD, and DoUGS, and has also been to faculty teaching committee, with actions arising to address the matter.

ACTION: DL to include further update on FoNS in next DPE report.

4.3 Expanding Educational Access Provisions for Disabled Students:

NP and DL reported they are going to submit a paper to Student Experience Committee for discussion on this matter at the next meeting on 16th March.

4.4 Rationale behind RCSU creating a list of “blacklist” places RCSU where suggests CSPs don’t hold events or discourage students from frequenting:

AP clarified that this was a suggestion from a wellbeing dep rep for the creation of a comments box where students can indicate places where they have felt unsafe on campus for example where they believe they have been spiked or if they have experienced sexual violence etc.

4.5 Science Challenge:

SR noted that last year’s markers still haven’t been paid, so this year’s markers are going to act as self-employed instead.

4.6 RCSU Life Sciences Petition regarding TRAs.

AP noted that the petition was a means for students in the department to express how they wanted their exams to be within the faculty. AP agreed to seek more information and to report back with more information at the next meeting.

4.7 Checking activity registration filter functionality on PowerApp

Action carried forward as awaiting update from SL.

4.8 Clarification on whether CSPs can book Union Bar on Wednesdays and Fridays

Action carried forward as awaiting update from SL

4.9 Reverse the order of OT reports on the agenda for the next meeting

Action completed but also carried forward as only voting on the OT reports this meeting rather than full discussion owing to time constraints.

4.10 OT Accountability Subgroup

Action complete as OT accountability being considered as part of Democratic Structures review.

Matters for Decision/Discussion

5 Requests to Reinstate Lost Seats

None received.

6 Motion on Union's Response to the Russia-Ukraine Invasion

GF presented the motion, as seconder, on behalf of the proposer who was unable to attend. GF noted that the proposers and seconders condemn the horrific scenes witnessed in Ukraine. GF noted that the motion proposed a two-pronged approach - by lobbying College to do more and by lobbying the Union to take a stance. GF noted the motion desired for both organisations to publicly take a stance and make a statement on what they believe about the issue at hand, but that the most important thing desired from the motion was for quick ways for advice and support to be available for affected students ie: an email address that can be responded to (within hours). GF noted the stresses facing students impacted by the conflict e.g. concerns about their families, homes and finances etc. and the need to ensure they are supported. GF further noted the need to support students who may be facing discrimination on the basis of their identifying as Russian and unfair generalisations/assumptions being made about Russian people because of the actions of the Russian state.

MF opened the item for discussion/debate. MML and SRK noted that they are part of Societal Engagement at the Business School and wanted to find out what ICU is doing so they can think about how the Business School can support. MML wondered whether petitions could be signed asking the government to waive/allow visas for individuals fleeing conflict.

Responding to the request of the motion for the College to issue a statement, HT noted a statement was put out via email 2nd March in the name of the College Provost and President condemning the Russian invasion. HT noted this would appear to cover the Resolves 2, 3 4 and 6 of the motion and therefore queried whether those lobbying objectives had already been achieved and if the Resolves should be just keep to points 1 and 5 re: what the union can do. GF noted that the motion had been written a while ago and so those points may now be slightly out of date. GF noted that. now the College's statement has been made, the lobbying focus should now be on ensuring that message is publicised for example via the College's social media channels, regular emails, newsletters etc. MF asked if Council wished to therefore amend the motion. LJ suggested that Council vote upon the motion as is and he will go away and figure out which aspects have already been completed in their entirety and what is still to do. Regarding Union Resolves 3, LJ noted that the College has already been quite proactive in terminating a number of relationships that they have with Russian business and in undertaking a comprehensive review of the full breadth of the College's partnerships with Russia to ensure they are not receiving funding from any state-owned corporations.

AA noted that he wholeheartedly agreed with the intent of the paper. AA also noted that it is important to keep in mind that Union Council might be setting a precedent that it needs to comment on every single geopolitical conflict that affects the students of Imperial, acknowledging that it is important to do so, but also acknowledging that Imperial has a very diverse international community. GF welcomed the consideration and noted there are numerous global conflicts at present. GF clarified that the motion under consideration was being put forward considering the rapidly evolving situation in Ukraine.

JC, responding to HT's earlier point, noted that some in the Imperial community no longer give much regard to branded emails from the College President, and queried whether it would be better to lobby for a comment from the College corporately rather than from the

President. LJ noted that College positions on matters tend to be authored by a member of the executive in communications. MF queried whether the College's position had also been placed on the College's website. LJ noted that it will be as all College's communications of such a nature are placed on the website. JC suggested whether the College could increase its communications and support resources beyond the one statement already made, which LJ noted for taking forward. GF as seconder was given the last opportunity to speak on the matter. GF thanked everyone and, in further response to AA's earlier point, suggested that whilst Union Council may not succeed in receiving motions on all current geopolitical conflicts, this motion passing might serve to demonstrate to students caught up in such situations that they can be supported in a similar way.

MF reminded members, regarding motions, that Union Council can't take a position on things that don't affect the union but noted that the motion presented is fine as the matters of its content clearly affect a number of the Union's members.

VOTE

25 for

1 against

3 abstentions

The motion was therefore carried.

7 Motion on ICU Position on History Dialogue Next Steps

LJ, as the motion proposer, noted that a College-wide email went out recently communicating the outcome of the History Group Project looking at certain aspects of the history of Imperial e.g. who different buildings are named after. LJ noted that President's Board have made the decision not to rename any buildings, but rather that they would set up a working group to evaluate the possibility of adding hyphenated additions to existing buildings' names. LJ noted that several members had approached him to protest the absurdity of this approach. LJ outlined the purpose of the motion was twofold: firstly to confirm that the Union believes that this approach is silly and that the College should do it, and secondly to propose that the Beit Building where the Union offices are situated may wish to be named differently given that Beit made his money from gold and diamond mining in South Africa under dubious circumstances.

AR stated that he comes from Mumbai where there is a famous college named after a Scottish person who did some good educational work despite playing a role in conquering the west side of Dubai. AR stated he wanted to add this discussion and MF thanked AR for his contribution.

AA praised the motion and stated agreement that double barrelling the name of buildings is silly but suggested that not having a position on the Huxley Building weakens the Union's position. AA noted he would be in favour of advocating for keeping Huxley given Huxley's abolitionist work. LJ stated disagreement with the need to take a separate position advocating for Huxley due to some of Huxley's problematic writings. LJ further stated that Beit has more relevance for the Union to take a specific stance on, given it is where the Union is headquartered. JC queried whether not taking a specific view on Huxley Building means the Union would amount to ignoring challenging some of his problematic writings. LJ replied that it would not, but rather clarified that there is in general a resounding opinion that Beit Building being named after Beit is problematic whereas the Imperial community's opinion is more divided Huxley given both his contribution to science and some of his writing.

MF asked whether Union Council would want to specify what is meant by 'reasonable timeframe' under Union Resolves 2A. LJ stated he was going to look at the dates of President's Board meetings to see what would be reasonable for getting a result.

VOTE

24 for

2 against

4 abs

The motion was therefore carried.

8 Motion to Oppose Imperial College's Continued Investment in the Fossil Fuel Industry

MO – from Divest Imperial, a student-led campaign for Imperial to withdraw any investments from the fossil fuel industry – proposed the motion, noting that in 2020, the College released its first socially responsible investment policy. MO noted that the policy said that the College Council will continue to invest in fossil fuel companies which are actively moving towards meeting the Paris Agreement targets, however a number of studies have shown that no such companies are aligned with meeting the targets. MO further noted that in November 2021 College released a 2nd policy explaining how the last statement be defined i.e., how to measure whether a company is compliant with Paris Agreement targets, and how Imperial should engage with these companies to encourage them to decarbonise. MO noted that shareholder influence is limited, and the motion proposes that Imperial should divest from fossil fuel companies immediately.

MF permitted SLo to comment. SLo noted his agreement with the intention of the motion and the point regarding the limited influence of stakeholder engagement, but noted that the College not directly investing in any fossil fuel companies. MO noted that although there may not be direct investments, according to the Engagement & Monitoring Policy, Imperial possessed £2 517 780 of direct and indirect investments in fossil fuel companies as of July 2021. MO further noted that Imperial hasn't taken a policy stance against directly investing in fossil fuel companies in the future.

VOTE

25 for

3 against

2 abstentions

The motion was therefore carried.

9 Motion on ICL's relationship with Stonewall and ICU's role in Protecting LGBTQIA+ Students

SF, as motion proposer, outlined that University College London (UCL) has cut ties with Stonewall. SF noted that most universities and finance firms have a relationship with Stonewall and so SF stated a belief that UCL cutting ties in this way sets precedent as the first to do so. SF stated he believes this is bad for students at UCL and that it could also be dangerous or cause distress for students at Imperial. SF outlined that the motion seeks to show support to Imperial students who may have experienced such distress. SF stated that UCL's actions amount to one way of removing support for queer students, and so queer students at Imperial students may now feel like there is less support for them within their city of study. SF also outlined that the motion would enable the Union to have a stance on the matter should a similar situation arise at Imperial. SF noted, finally, the motion would

mandate CR to reach out to other leading SUs in London and the UK, to encourage them to consider the matter.

LJ noted that earlier in the day NP and LJ attended the College's EDI Committee and this matter was on agenda, for which College indicated: there is no College intention to withdraw from Stonewall; there is little academic chatter on this matter; a few alumni have written to the College President as they are part of LGB alliance. LJ noted that the mention of academic faculty at UCL under Union Resolves 5A might be a bit out of the Union's scope as it is to do with another institution's staff and it is not clear what holding them accountable would look like in practice, and also queried what is sought by the mention of holding ICL staff accountable. MF asked if SF would be happy to remove UCL from Resolves 5A. SF agreed and noted, that regarding ICL staff, there are some faculty who publicly hold transphobic views and so holding them accountable would mean reducing relations with them. SF also noted the mandated action is deliberately left open-ended to enable OTs to take the matter forward as they see would be most effective. MF asked whether SF wished to amend the wording to clarify that, if such individuals were from outside of the College then relations with them would be lessened but if they are a member of the College community then the Union would publicly respond to their views .

RT noted that it was mentioned that the rationale behind UCL withdrawing from Stonewall was a concern regarding loss of academic freedom and asked SF if they had any thoughts regarding this. SF noted that this was actually included in a prior draft of the motion but was removed as it ended up becoming convoluted. SF noted that a leaked letter from UCL outlining the reasons for their withdrawal has become available online.

AA noted that there may be nuanced difference at times between what could be considered transphobic and what someone says, and voiced concern regarding Union Resolves 5c requiring CUs to make public statements, querying whether the practicalities of such might be best outlined in a separate paper. SF noted that some professors are saying things that are blatantly transphobic without nuance and so suggested amending the Union Resolves to refer to 'professors saying something completely/outwardly transphobic'. AA agreed that this seemed an improvement to the wording. MF note that SF or AA could bring a motion in due course to address the practical outworking for CUs if desired.

SF thanked everyone who was involved in drafting the paper and MF moved to a vote.

VOTE

25 for

1 reject

4 abstain

The motion was therefore carried.

10 Motion on Increase to Powers of Halls Committees

JW, as motion proposer, noted that there limitations on types events Halls Committees can run. JW asserted that this does not seem to make too much sense as societies have been running such similar events for years.

JC reported not being too familiar with halls committees but queried whether in seeking increased powers for Hall Seniors if it would put people off the role if it becomes too much work. JW responded that the motion is actually seeking increased flexibility for the type of events Halls can run. RT added that halls seniors run e.g. 3 events per term, and it is up to

them what type of events happen, and so clarified as motion seconder that the point of the motion is if CSPs can do events overnight then hall committees should be able to as well.

NMc asked for more info on what events currently run and if students are currently asking for overnight events. JW reported that at Wilson they are but reported not being sure about Beit and other halls. JW noted that overnight events could mean trips to other parts of the country. RT added a concern that might be blocking the issue is that some Hall residents are u18y.o., but noted that CSPs have some u18 members as well and so there should be a way of making it work.

VOTE

23 for

1 against

4 abstentions

The motion was therefore carried.

11 Motion to Improve the Endowment of ALERT

SLo presented the motion as proposer. SLo moved to add a Union Resolves 4 to state that the proposed two one-tonne testes to be added to ALERT should be paid for by the College's endowment fund. There was no dissention from Union Council regarding this proposed amendment and so it was agreed that the vote would be taken on the motion as amended.

NM commented that the motion may have been more compelling had it included a visual representation of what the proposed two one-tonne testes would look like. SLo apologised for the omission and noted it would be included in a Future publication of Felix.

AA asked what shape the proposed testes would be. MF added that it felt like Union Council would be giving SLo a blank cheque should the motion pass and therefore Council should query about the proposed testes. SLo responded that they would most likely be cubic in keeping with ALERT's design. MF requested that SLo bring design to next Union Council.

VOTE

20 for

2 against

5 abstentions

The motion was therefore carried.

12 Vote on Union President Report

Due to good time keeping, the opportunity was afforded for questions to OTs on their reports. LJ highlighted ICU Staff visit to Silwood Park, hosted by AA.

- i. A question was asked by AA regarding if there would be any PG student consultation on H-Bar changes. LJ responded that there would be, noting that this is essentially the next step of the renovation project. LJ explained it had been discovered that there is an entirely separate pot of money that has been allocated to H-Bar on the College's side (Campus Services), so there has been a task of figuring out how the money from the education side and Campus Services will come together in the H-Bar renovations; LJ noted that now this conversation has been had, the next step will be to consult PG students on H-Bar. NM asked how

this consultation work, noting not seeming to regularly receive any emails from the Union President/DPFS. MF noted that members should be receiving the All Student Email which is authored by Officer Trustees. LJ agreed to raise this issue of apparent non-receipt with the ICU Marketing Team. LJ noted that the PG consultation would happen primarily through elected PG representatives in the first instance but would also consider more general avenues of input as well.

- ii. A question was asked by GM regarding a reported tankards purge. LJ reported that tankards associated with tie clubs have been removed from the Union Bar as per the Union Bar policy set by Governance & Identity Board. LJ noted he has been in contact with tie club presidents to arrange collection.

UNION PRESIDENT SATISFACTION SCORE

2.44 average

0.82 standard deviation

13 Vote on DPFS Report

MF noted that as SL and IM sent apologies, if members have any questions for them they can communicate them to the Chair for passing on. Whilst votes were being taken, SLo asked a general question about what happens if an Officer Trustee receives the lowest score of -3. MF noted that this has never happened before. AA asked whether in voting members should be considering not just an OT's report but also their performance at the Union Council meeting. LJ queried whether AA meant by this how an OT responds to a question. AA confirmed that he did and queried what happens when an OT is not present to respond to questions. MF noted that a call for questions was circulated in advance of the meeting. but no questions were submitted.

DPFS SATISFACTION SCORE

1.71 average

1.33 standard deviation

14 Vote on DPCS Report

DPCS SATISFACTION SCORE

2.00 average

1.12 standard deviation

15 Vote on DPW Report

NP highlighted from her report: that the Student Disciplinary Review working group is continuing; met a representative from UoWarwick at UUK Conference on Bullying, Harassment and Sexual Misconduct who led the review around the UoWarwick 'Rape Chat' scandal; Reintegration of Imperial Community objective is continuing as business-as-usual and integrating it into the advice centre's outreach initiatives to ensure it is a rolling programme; EDI strategy work is progressing with discovery conversations taking place with key stakeholders.

- i. A question was asked by HW on the reported meeting held with the Chair of College Council, vis-à-vis the Independent Report into Bullying by Imperial's College President and CFO, regarding what was discussed and what were conclusions were drawn. NP noted that it was an exploratory conversation discussing how Imperial has got to where it is now and what needs to be done to

rebuild trust of the community. LJ noted, as context, that the Chair of College Council has been meeting various members of the College community following the report's release. HW therefore asked what the College was doing to take responsibility regarding the matters of the report. LJ noted that it has been suggested that there may need to be some evaluation of the College's existing culture change work, such as the Imperial Together scheme, as well as a more general governance review at the College.

DPW SATISFACTION SCORE

2.84 average

0.37 standard deviation

16 Vote on DPE Report

DL highlighted from his report that he lobbied the College to follow up on some student petitions regarding exam arrangements (in-person v TRAs).

There were no questions for DL.

DPE SATISFACTION SCORE

2.35 average

0.69 standard deviation

17 AOB

MF noted that the Union's Board of Trustees are seeking to maximise their visibility and openness to members and as such would like to invite Union Council members to an informal coffee morning at 11am on Wednesday 18 May 2022 in the Union Bar [*note: the event timing has since changed to be 12-1pm*]. CJ asked members to RSVP via email ASAP for catering purposes.