



## MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS

The first ordinary meeting of the Union Council

The meeting of Union Council was held on Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> November at 18:30 in RSMG01, Royal School of Mines

### **Present**

<b>Role</b>	<b>Name</b>
Council Chair	Lloyd James (Chair/THE CHAIR)
Union President	Abhijay Sood (AS)
Deputy President (Welfare)	Shervin Sabeghi (SS)
Deputy President (Education)	Ashley Brooks (AB)
Deputy President (Clubs & Societies)	Thomas Fernandez Debets (TFD)
Arts and Entertainment Sector Chair	Joseph O'Connell -Danes (JOD)
BME Officer	Deborah Adegoke (DA)
CGCU President	Thomas Cross (TC)
CGCU Vice President (Education)	Poppy Oldroyd (PO)
CGCU Vice President (Wellbeing)	Miles Gulliford (MG)
Ethics and Environment Officer	Francesca Siracusa (FS)
GSU President	Mohit Devgan (MD)
GSU Vice President (Representation)	Milia Hasbani (MH)
GSU PGR Academic & Welfare Officer (Engineering)	Raya El Laham – (REL)
ICSMSU President	Benjamin Russell (BR)
ICSMSU Academic Chair	Waseem Hasan (WH)
ICSMSU Welfare Officer	Jack Hall (JH)

Interfaith Officer	Amna Ahmed (AA)
LGBT Officer	Freya Hepworth Lloyd (FHL)
RCSU President	Alex Auyang (AAu)
RCSU Vice President (Education)	Michaela Flegrova (MF)
Recreation Sector Chair	Christopher Turner (CT)
RSMSU President	Christopher Carter (CC)
RSMSU Vice President (Education)	Alexandre de Saint Germain (ASG)
Disabilities Officer	Hilliam Tung (HT)
UG FoNS Council Rep	Grace Fisher (GF)
UG FoNS Council Rep	Aishwarya Chidambaram (AC)
PG FoNS Council Rep	Adrian LaMoury (AM)
UG FoE Council Rep	Fatima Khan (FK)
UG FoE Council Rep	Hayley Wong (HW)
PG FoE Council Rep	Luke Jamieson (THE CHAIR)
PG FoE Council Rep	Igor Gawron (IG)
PG NF Council Rep	Eoin O’Kane (EOK)
PG NF Council Rep	Rahul Jugnarain (RJ)
UG FoNS Council Rep	Zhidong Zuo (ZZ)
Silwood Park President (via Skype)	Conor Nicoll (CN)
Felix Editor (Attending)	Henry Alman (HA)
Representing Sports Sector (Attending)	Geoff Sheir (GS)

**Apologies:**

Sports Sector Chair	Ross Unwin (RU)
Deputy President (Finance and Services)	Fi-Fi Henry (FH)
RCSU Welfare Officer	Peter Hull (PH)



Item	Actions
<p><b>1. Chair's welcome and Chair's business.</b></p> <p>1. Chair welcomed the Council to the first meeting of the 2019/20 session. No Chair's business.</p>	
<p><b>2. Apologies:</b></p> <p>1. Fi-Fi Henry 2. Ross Unwin 3. Peter Hull</p>	
<p><b>3. Minutes of Previous Meeting</b></p> <p>1. Aside from a minor correction (RSMSU abbreviation is to be corrected to RSMU), the council agreed that the minutes were an accurate recording of the Union Council meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2019.</p>	
<p><b>4. Action Tracker</b></p> <p>1. The Chair noted that action tracker items should be clearly shown with their item number and title.</p> <p>2. DPCS updated the council on the current progress of transitioning CSPB into SHE and SPB. CSPB has not spit yet; further updates are due at next the Council session.</p> <p>3. Bye-laws update – The Chair said this is ongoing in conjunction with work related to policies. He said an update on this matter will be brought to next Council</p>	<p><b>RB to update action tracker</b></p> <p><b>DPCS to update council</b></p> <p><b>Chair to update council</b></p>
<p><b>5. Policy Reform Motion</b></p> <p><i>Amna Ahmed joined the meeting.</i></p> <p>1. The Chair gave a summary of the report as tabled, together with a presentation to elaborate on the background and rationale for changes to Union Council Policy and its sub-committee structure; the two main changes being delegation of policies from UC to Sub-Committees, and actions being tracked in an action tracker, rather than being published as policies. The Chair noted that council policies have lapsed, and therefore the motion also proposes to adopt and delegate a body of policy to allow Union Council to continue to function meaningfully. The Chair then invited questions.</p> <p>2. AB asked if policies are owned by a SC, do they amendments made to be approved at UC? The Chair said no, amendments made to policies that are under the remit of SC can be noted by</p>	

UC, but unless anything radical is proposed, that SC will own that policy entirely.

3. WH asked what the vehicle was for reps looking to introduce a proposal for a position on a certain matter for consideration by UC. The Chair responded that there were two ways – firstly, the action required would be recorded by the clerk in the council minutes, and also there would be specific actions where required, to direct officer trustees (for example) to publicise a position, or motion, and so on. WH asked if, in that case, positions of council are only formally recorded in the minutes. The Chair said that it depends on context. A stance on tuition fees, for example, is a position that would need to be publicised, so as well as the minutes there are specific actions raised to ensure this is done; but it is not changing any policy, and this is why from now on such actions are not published as policies.
4. JOD and IG asked if the changes discussed in the paper affect the way new policies are created if it is unclear which SC remit that policy should be part of. The Chair responded that there was no change. The Chair responded that there is no change in essence- if the motion proposed is passed, it is up to the proposer to decide whether a specific SC or UC itself should govern the policy.
5. The Chair concluded by saying the overall objective of the motion was to ensure that a manageable body of policy is in place, and remedy the current situation of all current policies having lapsed.
6. AS advised the UC that this matter was rather procedural in nature, but outlined that the policies form the main playbook for UC's activities throughout the year. AS said the streamlining will ensure that it is easier for student representatives to control specific policies as it pertains to their interest, and also it delegates more power downwards to UC stakeholders via the SC structure, improving democracy and inclusivity.
7. GS noted that a lot of policy at that has currently lapsed is important to the Sports Sector, and asked if it can be ensured that such policies are adopted. The Chair said that policies that are not re-adopted and delegated are able to be reintroduced immediately at the relevant SC meeting.
8. MD asked if the drugs policy has now lapsed. The Chair clarified that this policy along with certain others, are BoT policies and have not lapsed; they are shown alongside UC policies on the website which is the source of confusion.

<p>9. AA said that this motion proposes delegation of powers to SCs; he asked if it should not be within the SCs own power to decide what they should have overview over. The Chair said that the UC chair does not exert judgment over what suits various SCs.</p> <p>10. MF said that from previous experience, SCs preferred to let UC govern policies for ease of workload.</p> <p>11. IG asked for clarification on whether or not a SC could introduce a new policy by itself, without needing approval by UC. The Chair said yes, but only if the substance of the policy was clearly within the remit of the SC that wanted to introduce it.</p> <p>12. FS said that looking at item 5b, in her opinion it would perhaps be better to only have a list of policies that were removed, for ease of reference. The Chair responded that he constructed item 5b in this way in order to ensure all policies were properly delegated or removed.</p> <p>Union Council <b>approved</b> the motion.</p>	
<p><b>6. Proposal for an Elected PG Trustee</b></p> <p>1. AS asked if council members were against cutting off discussion of this item and moving to a vote after seven minutes. TBD objected, and the council voted by show of hands to instead spend fourteen minutes discussing the matter before it went to vote.</p> <p>2. AS then summarised the motion as tabled, noting there were concerns over this proposal. He said the intention was to guarantee PG matters were represented properly in the activities of BoT. AS said that the motion was to only approve the idea of a PG Trustee in principle, and then the issue of how the PG Trustee post is appointed can be decided later. AS then invited questions.</p> <p>3. MH said this proposal had been discussed at BoT, where it was decided UC was best placed to discuss this matter. The discussion at BoT centred around whether or not a PG Trustee should represent all students, as is the case with other student trustees, or whether they have a remit for PG matters.</p> <p>4. FS asked AS to summarise the concerns that AS noted in his summary. AS invited those who raised concerns to speak. SS said that his concern was with democratic imbalance; since the BoT considers general ICU matters that affect the whole student body, and Union Council has elected reps that have remits to represent specific sections of the student body, there is a risk that by having a PG student trustee PG students would</p>	

have a specific representation at BoT whilst other sections of the student body would not.

5. IG asked if the idea that Board of Trustees did not represent specific sections of the student body was defined in the constitution and bye-laws. The Chair said this is not defined.
6. CC said in that case union council could elect a UG student trustee, since nothing prevented this. AS responded that is one way of looking at it, but the rationale for this lies in the fact that PG students are an underrepresented section of the student body; UG students are already well represented and hence you could not make the argument to include a UG student trustee.
7. TC asked if the PG Trustee post would be for PGT, PGR or any PG representative at BoT. AS said it would be for all PG students. AS clarified the proposed election process for PG Student trustees for TC
8. CT said that PG students do have the opportunity to become a student trustee currently, so there is no need to create a specific post on BoT for PG students. He asked the problem lay instead with PG students not standing for these positions or regularly losing to other students during voting.
9. MF said that even if PGs are not engaged with union matters, it does not remove the need for Union Council to look to their concerns. As well as representation, this motion would encourage diversity of student trustees at BoT.
10. TFD said in response to MF that, echoing what SS said earlier (see 6.4) being a student trustee involves a lot more than representing PG students at meetings. He said he believed it is undemocratic to try and solve PG engagement issue by reserving a seat on board. TFD then clarified the four current student trustee positions for the benefit of members present.
11. SS said that CT was right in what he said that if the problem of PG engagement lies elsewhere, then creating a PG student trustee post does not solve the core problem. He said there was a risk that a PG student running a joke campaign could end up with a seat at Board.
12. CT said that if PG students do not care about the union then there is no point in them having a seat at BoT.
13. TC, MD and MF petitioned the Chair for more time to discuss. THE CHAIR held a vote by show of hands. Council voted to extend the discussion to allow further comments.
14. TC said that option 1.c on the motion paper (make the GSU President a Trustee Ex-Officio) seemed the best way forward to appoint a PG student trustee.

15. MD disagreed with CT's comments regarding PG engagement with union matters; the fact that there is an issue regarding the level of recorded engagement between ICU and the PG student body does not mean that PG students do not care about the union
16. CC said that in his opinion this motion was a heavy handed way to solve problem.
17. LJ said that there is a discrepancy with the motion; the motion says that the union believes there should be no strict quota for BoT membership, but then it resolves to create such a quota, and therefore he would not vote to approve this motion.
18. FS said that the grassroots approach discussed by SS and TFD is the best approach.
19. MH acknowledged the concerns raised over the motion, but said that whilst the PG student trustee would be selected from the PG student body, they would be bound to represent all students. MH said that the motion only concerns approving the motion in principle; options for how this new post would be filled can be debated at a later meeting.
20. Conor said that speaking from Silwood Park as a postgraduate he would strongly disagree with the concept that postgraduates do not care for the union. Underrepresentation does not indicate a lack of care, it may indicate a lack of inclusivity for these students. As a postgrad myself, I find the notion of undermining positions which promote postgraduate students to be a harmful idea.
21. LJ invited AS to respond to statements. AS said thanked UC for its comments, and even if this motion was not passed today, he would factor these comments in when looking at how PG students are engaged during leadership election cycles. He said, regarding comments over the discrepancies with quotas on the motion paper (see 6.17), the actual documented process of selecting a PG student trustee is not set in stone and members will have input on shaping the process of selection. AS added that the issues with PG engagement indicate a systemic problem, and this motion is a proposed change to that system with the view to remedying the underlying problem.
22. The Chair clarified a procedural question regarding the vote for CC.
23. The Chair asked if any more questions before break. MH proposed an action to review this proposal in the context of PG engagement. AS agreed to do this as a general action.

**AS to review proposal in the context of wider PG Engagement issues**



<p>Union Council <b>did not approve</b> the motion.</p> <p><i>The Chair adjourned the meeting for a short break.</i></p> <p><i>MH left the meeting.</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Election of Sub-Committee Members</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Chair summarised the procedure for electing members for SCs. IG requested an overview of the remit of SCs. The Chair outlined the remit of each SC.</li> <li>2. The Chair invited a show of hands from those who wished to be elected to sit on Governance &amp; Identity sub-committee. Only Hilliam Tung and Fatima Khan put themselves forward, and so they were automatically elected.</li> <li>3. The Chair invited a show of hands from those who wished to be elected to sit on Services and Sustainability sub-committee. Christopher Turner, Hayley Wong and Christopher Carter put forward, therefore the matter was moved to STV ballot. Each candidate gave a short pitch, detailing how their skills and experience made them suitable for the post. Christopher Carter and Christopher Turner were elected.</li> <li>4. The Chair invited a show of hands from those who wished to be elected to sit on Health and Safety sub-committee (which is a sub-committee of BoT). Only Igor Gawron and Francesca Siracusa put themselves forward and so they were automatically elected.</li> <li>5. The Chair noted that the meeting is running late and asked UC for an extra fifteen minutes to be added to the schedule in order to allow business to be concluded. The subsequent procedural motion to extend the meeting by fifteen minutes passed by show of hands.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>8. CGCU Report.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TC summarised the report as tabled. The Chair noted the mention of issues at Welcome Week and informed TC that CSPB were developing a specific policy to address this.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>9. RCSU Report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. AA summarised the report as tabled. Noted the RCSU logo is being redesigned and invited feedback.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>10. RSMU Report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CC summarised the report as tabled, noting matters such as outreach and International representation within RSMU.</li> </ol>	

<p>AS asked if RSMU had been interfacing with IC on the matter of outreach. CC responded that they were.</p> <p>2. AL asked for confirmation of reports of physical violence at the RSMU freshers' dinner. CC confirmed this was so and it has been dealt with appropriately.</p>	
<p><b>11. ICSMSU Report</b></p> <p>1. BR summarised the report as tabled. BR apologised on behalf of ICSMSU for the mumps outbreak.</p>	
<p><b>12. GSU Report</b></p> <p>1. MD summarised the report as tabled and invited feedback.</p> <p>2. TC asked if PGs are properly engaged with GSU activities, given comments made earlier. MD said that there are some issues and we are looking into solutions, interfacing with Imperial College. Updates will be ongoing throughout the year. JOD asked regarding the section pertaining to finances; it makes mention of a grant and as JOD understood the matter, it was restricted for spending only on publicity and ground hire. MD confirmed this was so and that this budget is mostly useless with regards to GSU strategy. MD outlined problems with business school withholding funds for all PG students, restricting their help to business PGs only. TFD said that it was his understanding that the Business School's grant was to assist GSU with interfacing with the officer trustees. TFD invited MD to discuss the matter further outside of the meeting.</p> <p>3. The Chair asked MD to clarify the Finance section and where it refers to SGI. MD said that he did not know why it was in the report and assured the members he would correct it. LJ invited MD to discuss this matter further with TFD outside the meeting.</p>	
<p><b>13. Felix Report</b></p> <p>1. HA summarised the report as tabled, noting he is having to commit a huge amount of working hours to deliver the paper on time.</p> <p>2. JOD and MF added along with HA concerning IT issues, there is a loss of knowledge from generation to generation.</p>	
<p><b>14. Chair's report</b></p> <p>1. The Chair summarised the report as tabled. AS added further information regarding new external trustees to be appointed to board – Professor Stephen Richardson and Phil Power are to be appointed. Asked UC to indicate their intention to ratify. TC asked for clarification of what the ratification motion will look like.</p>	

<p><b>15. President's report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. AS summarised the report as tabled.</li> <li>2. MG asked regarding the accessibility of Union, and if it was possible for some promotion of these meetings to be done. AS said he was already looking into this, working alongside SVC to ensure that at least there is proper promotion of major meetings that concerned issues affecting the entire student body.</li> </ol>	
<p>16. DPE report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Summarised report as tabled.. FS commented how PRES can be combined with NSS to inout into debate around PG engagement.</li> </ol> <p><i>IG left the meeting.</i></p>	
<p>17. DPW Report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SS summarised report as tabled.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>18. DPCS Report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TFD summarised the report as tabled.</li> <li>2. Geoff Sheir asked after progress made on the transport strategy. TFD said he is working with the student activities team to make meaningful progress, included rolling out a transport shuttle scheme to the Harlington campus, which is designed to fit in with the schedules of those teams based at Harlington campus.</li> </ol>	
<p>19. DPFS report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Chair summarised the DPFS report (on behalf of FH) as tabled.</li> </ol>	
<p>20. AOB</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TFD said there had been a previous commitment by IC to preserve the green space in South Kensington, namely the queen's lawn. However IC have now put forward plans to build a path running diagonally across the queen's lawn.</li> <li>2. TC said it is an awful idea. MF disagreed and said it will preserve the lawn if a small portion is used for foot traffic; MF clarified that she held no strong opinion, but said it is not a bad idea.</li> <li>3. JH where did the idea for this project originate from? TC added that there was a risk that this would encourage further encroachment on green spaces in South Kensington</li> </ol>	

<p>4. FT said that other options should be considered, such as flowers around the edge and these ideas should be considered</p> <p>5. GS said that regarding the timescale of such a project, he would prefer this to be done during winter.</p> <p>CS said that sitting in Silwood, he is surrounded by grass and nothing else. I now find it ironic that what very little green space that is available in South Kensington is being taken away. This does not appear to be the best idea</p> <p>AS noted there is already a path across the Princess Gardens lawn, so this idea is not without precedent. In his opinion, ICU should back the plan.</p> <p>The Chair directed members to TFD should they have further discussion points to raise regarding this matter.</p>	
<p><b>Next meeting: Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 18:30 – RSMG01 (RSM)</b></p>	