

Role	Name	Initials	Attendance
Officer Trustee - Union President	Hayley Wong	HW	Present
Officer Trustee - Deputy President (Education)	Jason Zheng	JZ	Present
Officer Trustee - Deputy President (Welfare)	Nathalie Podder	NP	Apologies
Officer Trustee - Deputy President (Clubs & Societies)	Dylan Hughes	DH	Present
Officer Trustee - Deputy President (Finance & Services)	Niamh McAuley	NM	Present
Council Chair	Yuki Yuan	YY	Present
Constituent Union President - ICSMSU	Christian Oldfield	CO	Present (seat reinstated during this meeting)
Constituent Union President - CGCU	Kia Popat	KP	Apologies
Constituent Union President - RSM	Josephine Onerhime	JO	Present
Constituent Union President - RCSU	Trinity Stenhouse	TS	Apologies
Constituent Union President - Silwood	Danica Duan	DDu	Absent
Management Group Chair - Arts	Celine Driessen	CD	Present
Management Group Chair - Community	Vacancy	N/A	N/A
Management Group Chair - Culture	Vacancy	N/A	N/A
Management Group Chair - Knowledge	Vacancy	N/A	N/A
Management Group Chair - Recreation	Stephanie Yeung	SY	Present
Management Group Chair - Sport	Christian Cooper	CC	Present
LCO - Black & Minority Ethnic Officer	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	RC	N/A
LCO - LGBT+ Officer	Devni Peramunugamage	DP	Present (seat reinstated during this meeting)
LCO - Disabilities	Jasmine Chan	JC	Apologies
LCO - Mental Health	Aglaia Freccero	AF	Present
LCO - Gender Equality Officer	Nancy Yang	NY	Present
LCO - Ethics & Environmental Officer	Riqi Zhang	RZ	Apologies
LCO - Interfaith Officer	Pratik Ramkumar	PR	Absent
LCO - International Officer	Lintong Li	LL	Absent
LCO - Working Class Officer	Jordan Elliott	JE	Present
Welfare Officer of CU - CGCU	David Zhou	DZ	Absent
Welfare Officer of CU - RCSU	Anthea MacIntosh-LaRocque	AML	Present
Welfare Officer of CU - ICSMSU	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	HI	N/A
Welfare Officer of CU - RSM	Shirley Xu	SX	Apologies
Academic Officer of CU - CGCU	Hugo Stanbury	HB	Present
Academic Officer of CU - RCSU	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	RW	N/A
Academic Officer of CU - ICSMSU	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	RI	N/A
Academic Officer of CU - RSM	Shoupan Li	ShLi	Absent
Postgraduate Research Academic & Welfare Officer (Engineering)	Kuan-Cheng Chen	KCC	Absent

Postgraduate Research Academic & Welfare Officer (Medicine)	Aryan Niknam Maleki	ANM	Proxy*
Postgraduate Research Academic & Welfare Officer (Science)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	GX	N/A
Postgraduate Taught Academic & Welfare Officer (Business)	Théophile Lesecq	TL	Present
Postgraduate Taught Academic & Welfare Officer (Engineering)	Swapnil Kumar	SK	Present
The PGR Representation Chair	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	CY	N/A
The PGT Representation Chair	Shangyi Liu	SLiu	Absent
Council Representative (UG Science)	Ding Ding	DDi	Present
Council Representative (UG Science)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	SF	N/A
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Vacancy	YuY	N/A
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Rea Tresa	RT	Present
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	SCh	N/A
Council Representative (UG Medicine)	Sasha Lisitsyna	SaL	Apologies
Council Representative (UG Medicine)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	HY	N/A
Council Representative (PG Science)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	MM	N/A
Council Representative (PG Science)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	TW	N/A
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	N/A	N/A
Council Representative (PG Business)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	N/A	N/A
Council Representative (PG Business)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	N/A	N/A
Council Representative (PG Medicine)	Eric Auyang	EA	Apologies
Council Representative (PG Medicine)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	SL	N/A
Council Representative (PG Engineering)	Yanda Tao	YT	Present
Council Representative (PG Engineering)	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	XH	N/A

In attendance [Students/Staff]

Clem Jones (CJ) – ICU Governance & Democracy Coordinator [Union Staff]

Annette Ma (AM) – ICU Governance & Representation Assistant [Union Staff]

Sam Lovatt (SL) – Student Trustee, former Felix Editor [Student Trustee]

Sarah Nabulsi (SN) – Felix secretary, present until item 4 [Student]

Mark Skopec (MS) – Department Rep for Department of Public Health, proxy for ANM*
[Student]

1. Welcome

YY welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Apologies & Chair's Business

Apologies

Noted as above.

*Proxies

Request for MS to proxy for ANM was approved by Union Council.

Proxy request approved by majority vote.

Reinstatement of Seats Lost Due to Two Missed Consecutive Meetings

CO

- i. CO stated for the first missed meeting he was hosting a webinar with the head of the medical school, Amir Sam, for changes on the application process on becoming doctors. Secondly, he was singing at ICSM Fashion Show at Clapham Grand for the second missed meeting.
- ii. YY noted apologies were sent for both missed meetings

Seat reinstated by Union Council by majority vote in favour.

DP

- i. DP stated she was hosting the LGBT+ careers fair as part of her role and then unwell respectively regarding the two missed meetings.

Seat reinstated by Union Council majority vote in favour.

Quorum Check

Confirmed.

3. Minutes & Action Tracker

Minutes of the Ordinary Union Council Meeting held on 7 March 2022

Approved by consensus as an accurate record of proceedings.

4. Motion on Felix Editor Selection Process

SL presented the paper as its author.

SL stated he had received questions about the paper prior to the meeting and clarified the motion is proposed to Union Council; the second half of the paper is a first draft and not the finalised selection process for the Felix Editor.

SL stated the Editors in position for the last 4-5 years have been consistently below standard. SL noted the selection process described in the paper was based off his experiences of application processes for several journalism courses.

- i. AML noted the paper describes 1 of the 5 panel members as a member of the College Communications Team, and raised a potential conflict of interest issue

with said member. AML raised an example of the article published by Felix on the Department of Physics, regarding which Felix was approached by the Communications Team for interfering with the publishing, although Felix ignored the interference attempt; AML suggested that, if the Felix member who had written that article were to take part in the proposed selection process, they may therefore face a disadvantage, and thus AML expressed uncertainty on why this College staff member should be on the selection panel. SL responded that the Communications Team member is the only available expert on journalism, and that other members do not have the expert knowledge on journalism or PR. SL expressed that the panel would not pick the Editor based on a candidates' intention to comply with College wishes or not, and also expressed that said College staff member would be only 1 of 5 members on the panel. AML countered that the concern was not so much that such a College staff member might be biased towards the most 'compliant' candidate, but rather towards someone who would be more critical of the College. AML also mentioned the only aspect in the Editor position that needs a qualified journalist is the writing test (because they can evaluate pieces of writing), but posited that one might agree that anyone working in the education field could make an adequate judgement. SL noted the Communications member adds a minority to the mix of the selection panel and noted they would have better judgement. AML stated that the risk of the bias made by the Communications member far outweighs the ability of one person to judge the writing of an article.

- ii. Secondly, AML noted the appointment process includes a spelling test and stated it categorically disadvantages dyslexic people. AML mentioned it should be easy to have online spell checks and Editors do not necessarily need to prove their spelling ability. SL noted it is a test he personally would include in the process, having applied for postgraduate courses in journalism, and noted this was not made to discriminate people. AML expressed that a belief that postgraduate courses do discriminate against dyslexic people, and additionally criticised the time limit set for the test, where people would not be able to correct themselves afterwards.
- iii. AML said the paper mentioned scenario-based reasoning and wondered how candidates would show communication skills with people in positions of authority, as the panel is made of people of authority. AML also noted it may also be disadvantageous to people who have already interacted with the panel members before. AML suggested to set up a mock scenario on speaking with people of authority and noted disapproval on passing a paper that implies scenario-based reasoning as the interview. SL clarified the tests on scenario-based reasoning refers to the general selection process and reiterated the appendix is not the final selection process. SL further explained the Communications Team has no power over the paper and can only speak to Felix as a journalist or apply pressure on making editorial changes, but cannot control what is published, and that part of the reasoning skills is applied when dealing with that pressure.
- iv. **AML proposed amendments to: a) remove UR3 i.e. the commitment to the process appended to the motion, and b) remove the member of the College Communications Team from the selection panel for the Felix Editor (under UR4).**
- v. NM suggested that the amendment to remove Union Resolves 3 is not needed. NM expressed disagreement about the 2nd amendment proposed on removing the Communications Team member, adding that it should be required and that full-time staff would be able to act impartially. NM also noted they are the only

- specialist in journalism on the panel and they would be suitable panel members when situations arise dealing with certain legal issues in publishing, concluding that she does not think there is a conflict of interest.
- vi. **NM proposed an alternative amendment to: add a new Union Resolve [6] that the final selection of the successful candidate should be ratified by Union Council to ensure democratic element. SL accepted the amendment** and the amendment was duly therefore incorporated into the main motion.
 - vii. SL asked for further clarification on NM's proposal to remove Union Resolves 3. NM responded that it may not be the exact wording on what is wanted to be defined. SL followed up saying there is a need to define the process. DH suggested to finalise the paper then mandate ratification by Union Council to ensure UC members' comments are heard. CC also agreed on adding the requirement to approve the process, whether it is done by UC or the Board. CC also raised that the paper does not specify whether the selection panel will be ratified by UC.
 - viii. CC then asked for the reasoning behind specifying 'student trustee' instead of 'officer trustee' to be on the selection panel. SL responded OTs may be biased, and while the Communications Team is professional in their role and whatever is mentioned in Felix publications may be degrees removed from the team, whereas Felix may directly critique the work of OTs.
 - ix. JE raised the issue that democracy could be compromised, and asked how it would be ensured that candidates presented to the selection panel are already above the baseline level of requirement. JE also asked how the student body could vote on this if there are only a handful of members that seem to pass requirements. JE asked what the best solution would be if only one candidate is selected to then be voted on by the student body as this does not pose a high level of democracy. SL explained that the Felix Editor is not a democratic role and does not involve representation or mandate; as the Felix Editor is simply in charge of the Felix newspaper, the proposed selection process is closer to a job recruitment. SL also noted that Felix states that any articles sent to them are published unless they are explicitly offensive, so complaints of article rejections would be sent to the Union as Felix is run by Imperial College Union. SL further mentioned that student democracy is currently disengaged from the Editor position as, which holds a salary per year, is usually decided by merely 200-300 votes. JE responded that Felix represents students' interests and reports news on behalf of students, and is unsure why SL would not want students to have a say in the selection of the Editor role. SL countered the selection process does not represent the student voice in the paper since anyone at Imperial can write for Felix and be published even if the article is of low standard.
 - x. CO said as it is a full-time job to be a journalist, a panel without any member in the journalism field does not do the selection process justice.
 - xi. HW noted the point raised on having a mixed appointment process, but stated this cannot be implemented in time this year as elections are done during the middle of the term. HW mentioned the Union is planning to conduct a full democracy review next year, so the appointment process can be approved first and then be included in the democratic review at a later timepoint.
 - xii. CD recalled that SL mentioned Felix is not representative at all, however expressed that Felix does represent Imperial CSPs, as a common way to engage with writers for the paper. SL clarified the Felix Society only exists to run finances according to CSP terms, but writers do not have to be a member of the society to publish an article. CD mentioned the CSP and Union sides of Felix do not get

together at all, and also raised issues that the Felix Editor has not worked well with the CSP committee members in the past, hence suggesting to reconsider the management of the Felix as a CSP. SL responded that Felix does not run as a CSP and the CSP aspect is rather irrelevant, with print budgets and writer socials all managed outside the CSP.

- xiii. DH asked about the consequences if no one is appointable. SL stated the current consideration would be to reopen the role for applications indefinitely without adhering to Union elections timings, and to put publishing on pause in the beginning of the academic year until someone is appointed. SL expressed that he would rather not have Felix publish in the beginning if all applicants were below threshold as it would be a waste of money on printing. SL also voiced the alternative of having volunteers run the paper as it currently is, but the odds of having eager volunteers for the next year are slim and may be stressful for parties involved.
- xiv. CD indicated that the motion does not mention who will be taking the spot of the Felix Editor in the panel if they are re-applying. SL responded it is intentionally left vague and that it is not a necessary spot to be filled.
- xv. YY asked SL whether he accepted an **amendment proposed by DH for UR3 to say instead that “an appointment process will be made and ratified by Union Council”**. SL said the proposal seems vague with no specifications on who or when, but the current resolve is also too binding, stating he is unsure what the middle ground would be. DH clarified for the amendment end **“by next Union council”**. CJ advised that the June Council may be risky with reaching quoracy, but DH followed it must be the next Council or it will happen next year instead. **SL accepted the amendment that “an appointment process will be made by the next Union Council and ratified by the Union Council”**.
- xvi. CC asked whether it is necessary for ratification by Council, when approval is needed for the interview panel already, and stated it seems unnecessary to distrust the panel to determine the selection process. CO clarified that the approval of the paper coming to the next Council that will outline the process will be rather important.
- xvii. **AML proposed amendment on UR2 to have the appointment process not take place in the summer but in the spring term instead, so as to leave time for byelections in the summer term if necessary. SL accepted the amendment.** JZ clarified this amendment will be integrated in the next year.
- xviii. AML proposed to increase size of panel to reduce any potential bias from college comms team being 1/5 of panel, and to increase engagement by student. NM rebutted AML saying the paper states to have ‘at least’ 5 members, and said there is no need to specify a student member to be included in the panel, where either the Felix Editor, or the Chair if the Editor is reapplying, should be sufficient. **NM proposed an amendment to UR4: “The final selection panel for the Editor each year should include, at least, one Student Trustee, the Union Director of Membership Services, the out-going Felix Editor (if not re-applying) or the outgoing Felix Chair (if the Felix Editor is reapplying), one member of the College Communications team, and one other member of Union Council that is not an Officer Trustee. The majority of this panel must be students, and there should be at least five members on the panel”**. **SL accepted the amendment on resolve 4.**
- xix. CC asked for the next actions after the paper is approved. NM replied it will be put into Union Byelaws. CJ clarified the specific operational process of

- appointment would not necessarily be incorporated into Byelaws but broad principles about the appointment nature of the Felix Editor position could be.
- xx. **JE proposed an amendment to add a Union Resolves [7] that if multiple candidates meet minimum competency level deemed by the selection panel, then they will be brought to council for a democratic vote.** CO said this is rather a big amendment to propose and needs more discussion. CC commented if interview board cannot finalise a candidate, then the Student Council is unlikely to do so. JE clarified the panel can select which candidate will be best based on the criteria, but to increase democracy from the student body, the Council should be able to pick from candidates that meet the requirement.

Since SL as motion proposer did not accept the proposed amendment, the amendment opened for debate, and YY moved to discussions on the amendment proposed by JE to add a new Union Resolve [7]:

- i. JE explained the risk that candidates to be voted on do not meet the minimum standard even though it is selected by the panel.
- ii. JO raised possible risks around passing on the baton to members of close relationship, describing having a small circle to decide on the Editor that could be a barrier to inclusion.
- iii. CC raised the possibility of having the panel produce a short report on reasoning of choice if there are worries about transparency. SL rejected the suggestion. CO added that ratification is to give justification and does not believe UC will be able to make a better discussion within the limited meeting time.
- iv. NM said providing a recommendation of candidates is unreasonable as it is unlikely that all candidates pass the selection process, and it defeats the point of having an interview panel be brought to the Council. NM prompted Council to put more trust in the Union's full-time staff being capable of running interviews. YY asked for clarification on NM's view, to which she replied she is entirely against the proposed amendment.
- v. HW stated a 10-minute discussion on the Council is not better than trusting an entire panel to make the decision. JE clarified his understanding was the panel would make sure candidates are of minimum standard where more than one suitable candidate would be chosen.
- vi. SL echoed HW's comment and expressed uncertainty on what the Council would be voting on, where it would simply result to another student lottery. SL stated Union roles all have a big effect towards student experience, but students do not have a say in all the appointment processes and the role Felix Editor should also be treated as such.
- vii. JE raised that the final selection of the panel would not be limited to recommending one candidate only.
- viii. CC added analogies should be drawn with the ratification of student trustees, where the Council is simply ratifying giving a final approval on the decision made by panel members. JE expressed that the panel should not just put forward one candidate.
- ix. MS raised that if the Council rejects the first candidate recommended by the panel, then the panel can continue and recommend the second best candidate and so on. JE commented the next recommendation could take time and be recommended in the following Council meeting, as the Council is also voting on whether the position will be filled immediately, or if there will be a delay.

Dissent on the proposed amendment was raised by Council members so YY moved to a vote.

The proposed amendment was lost by a majority voting against.

3 in favour, 14 against, 5 recording an abstention.

YY asked the Council to vote on the motion as amended.

The motion as amended was carried by a majority voting in favour.

21 in favour, 1 against, 0 in abstention.

5. Complaints & Disciplinary Review

HW led the discussion.

HW noted as mentioned in page 24 of the recent Felix newspaper issue, the College has finished the Complaints & Disciplinary Review, in which HW, JZ, and NP were involved. HW noted they are now reviewing the Union's complaints and disciplinary procedures and currently in the consultation phase. HW asked for general comments from the Council.

- i. CO voiced support for the paper and voiced a small suggestion to send details of qualified support services when writing up the guidance regarding mental health services available to students going through these processes. HW clarified the Byelaws should contain broad principles, and then process should be detailed in operational processes, where such support could be listed.
- ii. AML expressed agreement with all the remarks made so far, and commented that the paper may be missing concrete details on having cases of complaints made known to both the Union and the College if the person involved could be at risk of harming another student. HW clarified that any serious cases will be referred to the College and the Provost will assess the risks and consider suspending a student if necessary; the College also send information to HW via email on student suspensions from the College, and ask her to consider suspension of the student from the Union.
- iii. AML asked regarding recommended training for all Disciplinary Panel members, whether members are decided in the beginning of the academic year. HW responded that panel members are approved by the Governance and Membership Committee, who also lead the training.
- iv. JE asked whether voting rights are taken away from students suspended by the Union during the investigation process. HW said they can vote but cannot stand for a role. JE asked whether votes cast would be removed from elections if the final outcome of an investigation is to suspend the student, to which HW said no.
- v. CC inquired on the procedures on communicating suspensions, noting possible issues in communicating with CSPs. HW responded there is an internal disciplinary process to inform CSP chairs. CC asked whether it is required for chairs to keep the information confidential. HW noted if the chair continues to spread the information then it also becomes a disciplinary issue. CJ added clarification (as the Union Complaints Officer), that when the suspension process is enacted, there are requirements for an information cascade, where CSP chairs or presidents involved would most likely be informed by CJ that the suspension due to disciplinary matters, but with no further reason given on the disciplinary matter. CC noted from being involved with CSPs, he would not be surprised if the

chair shared the information at least with the rest of the committee. DH said the chair can tell the committee that the suspended student cannot attend CSP events, but should be sensitive with wording. DH noted the Union cannot write down all possible phrases that are acceptable to say on sharing the information but hopes that the people involved will handle the situation with discretion.

HW asked the Council on their thoughts regarding whether non-commitment to an elected role should constitute a disciplinary case, noting the variation of views towards this over the years.

- i. JE asked for the definition of non-commitment. HW defined it where the student has done no work at all. JE noted whatever the minimum standard of work is set at, some students will simply do just above the minimum work to avoid trouble.
- ii. CO agreed that a simple structure could be put in place, especially if there is a lot of responsibility involved. CO mentioned the ICSM Treasurer last year did not complete their role, adding a lot of stress to other members, and the member did not even allow someone else to step in the role.
- iii. NM suggested it depends on the role, for example, there should be action if they hold financial responsibility. NM also noted there should not be a disciplinary procedure if there are negative consequences for the CSP.
- iv. NM asked what the procedure outcome would be for a small role, to which HW responded the removal of the role. NM asked whether there would be a record of the removal due to disciplinary procedures. HW responded it will be decided later.
- v. CC expressed agreement on the constitution, noting it should be considered when someone doesn't fulfil the constituent obligations, where students in roles usually go beyond the obligations. HW noted a policy in place that could escalate the situation to the DPCS. HE suggested the first port of call should be the CSP committee, then the DPCS, then the Student Disciplinary Panel based on recommendations.
- vi. DH stated it is worth implementing a process, as it is more common than expected that students aren't fulfilling their constitution roles.
- vii. CC mentioned the current mechanisms to remove students from small committee roles, and DH clarified he is referring to the Strikes policy, which is being looked at in the disciplinary package. DH noted they ultimately want to cover the gap in the Strikes policy, and there are methods on raising the disciplinary level.
- viii. DH also noted a need to draw a distinction between someone not being as good as the committee ideally wants, and when they are not fulfilling the role at all, as it would be dangerous if someone throws a student into a disciplinary procedure merely from not doing an event they wanted.
- ix. RT asked whether student volunteers and representatives would also follow the procedure, to which HW responded all members are included.
- x. RT also asked how VONCing will fit in the picture. HW responded if the Council were to agree on this, it will be done both ways with clearer guidance provided, to be discussed later.
- xi. JZ expressed concerns about using a disciplinary procedure to remove someone from their role. JZ stated there may be personal reasons in which they should step down but going through a disciplinary procedure and its associated connotations is concerning. JZ noted he is unsure whether it is needed to put students through something that sounds negative and scary. HW said the alternative would be VONCing, which she argues is worse.

HW asked for Council's comments: on the suite of penalties in the Byelaws, opinions on Byelaw G, or any other issues in any processes. No comments offered, so HW noted the consultation is open until 11 May and encouraged Council to ask those that may be interested to contact her via email.

6. Scrutiny Committee Report

YY referred members to the paper which Union Council received.

DH clarified regarding general updates about the students fund is mainly on increasing access of disadvantaged students to community or activity spaces. DH noted more details will be provided either in the next Council meeting or in the CSP projects. DH explained the updates given to the Scrutiny Committee was vague as the paper deadline was today.

7. AOB

Marking and Assessment Boycott

JZ noted that the UCU has notified the College of a marking and assessment boycott from 17 May, and the College responded last week that they are withholding 25% of pay per day from staff members participating in the boycott.

JZ also noted a senate meeting will be held tomorrow to discuss options for the College regarding graduation due to students missing marks from the boycotts. JZ explained one option is to provide temporary results to students and allow students to pass without receiving marks in all modules.

JZ noted he is happy to take questions from the Council.

- i. NM asked if he has an idea on the size of impact. JZ replied the final year students, especially the Physics department, will be most affected.

College Council - [Confidential item]

End of Union Council

YY thanked everyone for their participation and closed the meeting at 8pm. YY noted the next meeting will be held on 30th May.