

<u>Role</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Initials</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
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	Present
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
Constituent Union President - CGCU	Kia Popat	KP	Apologies
Constituent Union President - RSM	Josephine Onerhime	JO	Present
Constituent Union President - RCSU	Trinity Stenhouse	TS	Absent
Constituent Union President - Silwood	Danica Duan	DDu	Proxy*
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	N/A	N/A
LCO - LGBT+ Officer	Devni Peramunugamage	DP	Apologies
LCO - Disabilities	Jasmine Chan	JC	Present
LCO - Mental Health	Aglaia Freccero	AF	Apologies
LCO - Gender Equality Officer	Nancy Yang	NY	Present
LCO - Ethics & Environmental Officer	Riqi Zhang	RZ	Present
LCO - Interfaith Officer	Pratik Ramkumar	PR	Present
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	AM	Apologies
Welfare Officer of CU - ICSMSU	Seat Lost under Byelaw A.3	N/A	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	Runtian Wu	RW	Present
Academic Officer of CU - ICSMSU	Rayyan (Safeer) Islam	RI	Absent
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	Present
Postgraduate Research Academic & Welfare Officer (Science)	Guo Xinyi	GX	Absent
Postgraduate Taught Academic & Welfare Officer (Business)	Théophile Lesecq	TL	Present
Postgraduate Taught Academic & Welfare Officer (Engineering)	Swapnil Kumar	SK	Present
The PGR Representation Chair	Chengning Yao	CY	Absent
The PGT Representation Chair	Shangyi Liu	SLiu	Apologies
Council Representative (UG Science)	Ding Ding	DDi	Present
Council Representative (UG Science)	Stefano Fiocca	SF	Absent
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Ben Ford	BF	Present

Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Rea Tresa	RT	Present
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Shaheer Chaudry	SC	Apologies
Council Representative (UG Medicine)	Sasha Lisitsyna	SaL	Present
Council Representative (UG Medicine)	Hao Ze Yang	HY	Present (late)
Council Representative (PG Science)	Mahmood Mubarak	MM	Present
Council Representative (PG Science)	Tianyu Wen	TW	Apologies
Council Representative (UG Engineering)	Yueyang Yu	YueY	Apologies
Council Representative (PG Business)	Yilu Shi	YS	Present
Council Representative (PG Business)	Akshaya Anil	AAn	Absent
Council Representative (PG Medicine)	Eric Auyang	EA	Present
Council Representative (PG Medicine)	Songyang Li	SL	Apologies
Council Representative (PG Engineering)	Yanda Tao	YT	Apologies
Council Representative (PG Engineering)	Xinyi Huang	XH	Absent

In attendance

*Alex Auyang (AA) – Silwood Treasurer

Cat Turhan (CT) – ICU Representation & Advice Manager

Clem Jones (CJ) – ICU Governance & Democracy Coordinator

Dipto Basu (DB) – ICU Policy & Research Officer

1. Welcome, Proxies & Quorum Check

Welcome

YY welcomed all to the meeting. Noted that the Chair had not received any requests to reinstate any lost seats.

Proxy Requests

YY noted she had received the following proxy requests for the meeting:

AA to act as proxy for DDu.

RW to act as proxy for AM

HW noted that members may not delegate their proxy to another Member of Council. It was therefore noted that RW would feed in AM's comments but would not be able to proxy vote.

Quorum Check

Confirmed.

2. Apologies for Absence

Noted as above.

3. Minutes & Action Tracker

Minutes of the Ordinary Union Council Meeting held on 8 November 2022

NP asked if her question under 10.iv could be clarified to read “NP asked JO what impact having joint staff-student socials has had on creating culture of partnership between staff and students”. Council approved the minutes as an accurate record subject to the revision.

Minutes of the Extraordinary Union Council Meeting held on 22 November 2022

Approved as an accurate record of proceedings.

Action Tracker

Noted that the top of Theta had been found under the sofas in the CGCU office and having enjoyed a nice day out on Saturday is now stored in a lockable location.

4. Elections Byelaw J Review

HW presented the motion as the motion proposer.

- i. RW agreed with the proposal under the proposed clause 37 that byelection timetables need not be ratified by Union Council, arguing that this would delay the speed at which byelections can be facilitated for filling vacant positions.
- ii. BF argued that the removal of clause 26 takes away the requirement for there to be a determined time when candidates will be informed of hustings formats. HW noted the intention was to enable union staff to give candidates as reasonably advance notice as possible.
- iii. AA asked whether as well as the Returning Officer’s declaration of election results under the proposed clause 35 there could be an email sent as well, arguing students wouldn’t know the result of an election unless they are informed. CC stated he disagreed, arguing that election results are published on the Union’s website and those involved in elections would be keen to check for updates.
- iv. AA also asked regarding the proposed clause 36 whether the provision to delay the announcement of election results under would mean delaying the publishing of the result of every role in an election. CT noted that the provision was to cover any unforeseen circumstances that could arise requiring the announcement of results to be delayed and would be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, and to ensure that an update regarding any need to delay is publicised to members.
- v. RW asked for clarification on the meaning of ‘1 clear day’ in the Byelaw. CJ noted that in the ICU constitution this is defined as, in relation to the period of a notice, that period excluding the College working day when the notice is given or deemed to be given and the College working day for which it is given or on which it is to take effect.
- vi. RW also asked for clarification on why it had been proposed that clause 12 be removed. HW noted that the wording of “no candidate may challenge the result of the election once the count has been held” was felt to be unclear in terms of what this refers to, noting for example that a complaint regarding the Conduct of the Returning Officer can be raised.
- vii. HS argued that there is a flaw in the proposals in that the transfer of disqualification powers from the Governance & Membership Committee to the Returning Officer may be less democratic.

VOTE

26 voted in favour

2 voted against

1 recorded abstention

Council ratified the proposed updates to Byelaw J (Major Elections). HZ

5. Alumni Trustee (Re-)Appointment

HW presented the motion as the motion proposer, highlighting that Phil Power has dedicated a lot of time to supporting the Union by for example Chairing the Governance & Membership Committee. A question was asked checking if Phil Power had confirmed he wished to continue as a Trustee, which was confirmed.

VOTE

30 voted in favour, 0 votes against or to abstain. *Phil Power re-appointment confirmed.*

6. Union Position on Imperial History Dialogue

HW presented the motion as its proper, stating that she would like Union Council to debate the motion's Union Believes (UB) points 4 and 6.

- i. RW asked about the digital screens mentioned in UB6 i.e., why the College want to put up digital screens around the plaque of Beit at the entrance of the building. HW noted the College want to put up an information screen of sorts outside the entrance of Beit giving some context, both good and bad– highlighting what was good about his work but also noting some of his actions that don't align with our values today.
- ii. PK asked regarding UN6 - that Abdus Salam's family are in favour of the double-barrelled re-naming proposal for Huxley Building – whether that is their first preference, or if it was the only option presented to them. HW reported she understands that the College approached the family with double barrel option.
- iii. AA voiced disagreement with the assessment of Huxley in the motion; AA stated Huxley was an abolitionist and a strong supporter of women in higher education. AA proposed an amendment to remove UB4 from the motion. HW stated she would like to hear Council's opinion on the following: following research by the History Group, their opinion was that Huxley's name should be removed as although some of his views could be considered progressive for his time, many of his views don't align with the institution's values today. CC asked, if the report was categorical in its conclusion that Huxley's name should be removed, why University Management Board suggested double-barrelling the name of the building. HW noted that UMB may have taken into account alumni views. RT asked if Huxley had donated money to Imperial, suggesting it might be hypocritical if the community is happy to have benefitted financially from them only to say their name should not be used. HW noted Huxley's involvement in the College was many years ago and suggested that the question is whether the community now wishes to change course. CC added that the College crest was updated a few years ago to no longer include the imperialist motto on any new materials and perhaps a parallel could be drawn. CO stated he agreed with AA regarding UB4 and also suggested that the dual naming of Huxley building may not resolve the issue. MM argued it is important to acknowledge that negative things done by someone does not cancel the good things also done by that person, and noted in case of Huxley he was progressive in many thing for his time. MM also argued that the contextualising digital screens seem to be a solution, but welcomed the debate on whether UB4 should remain in the motion as he perhaps should not be celebrated nowadays. JO asked for clarification if

the dual naming proposal is the only option for re-naming the Huxley Building. HW noted that UN5 indicated the are the proposals going to UMB. JO noted that the RSM has similar issues, but suggested there needs to be a focus on getting rid of racist systems rather than racist symbols e.g., digital screens are a good measure to contextualise Huxley and the era he was part of but at the end of the day focusing on names may be a bit superficial. JE asked if there would be a way to honour those being considered as the replacement names for Beit and Huxley even if the names of the Beit and Huxley buildings are not changed. HW noted in the motion she had only included History Group actions relating the proposed Union position but noted there were other History Group actions e.g. naming PhD programmes after people the History Group recommend should be celebrated. In summary, HW that perhaps Council would like to: retain UB4 in order to indicate that some of Huxley's work was progressive some of his views do not merit celebration by today's standards; remove Huxley from UB6, to indicate that the use of digital screens to contextualise the issues relating to him are sufficient. AA argued that this was not a sufficient amendment.

- iv. JO asked a question on UR 3+4 regarding whether the poll of student opinion could be prioritised. HW noted the reason for prioritising the lobbying effort is if UMB do respond to the lobby to rename the buildings based on a Union position then the wider poll of members on the issue is redundant as the Union's position will have been achieved.
- v. HW proposed a vote on the suggested amendment to remove UB4, in order to seek Council's mind on that specific point.

Vote on first proposed amendment - to remove UB4 from the motion

10 voted for

9 voted against

8 recorded abstentions

As some members had not voted, a revote was taken.

Revote on first proposed amendment - to remove UB4 from the motion

10 voted for

6 voted against

13 recorded abstentions

Council voted to amend the proposed motion by removing UR4.

Vote on second proposed amendment – to remove UR2 and UR4 from the motion

HW stated she was very happy to accept the removal of UB4 as per the vote just taken and therefore proposed whether it would make sense for Council to also remove UR2 and UR4.

21 voted for.

Council voted to amend the proposed motion by removing UR2 and UR4.

Vote on the motion as amended

25 voted in favour

2 voted against

0 recorded abstentions.

The motion carried.

7. Scrutiny Committee Report

CC presented the report, noting that the general consensus of the Committee is that progress on the OTs' objectives have been fulfilled or are underway so far. CC noted the Committee wished to follow up with a few questions on behalf of Council:

- i. CC asked HW, regarding Objective 5 on improving communication, what was in place for improving the Union website. HW noted that the Union is currently undertaking a Digital Transformation Project as mentioned in DH's Objective 1 update, and noted that the project involves looking at creating a structured, coherent roadmap for the Union's systems development moving forward.
- ii. CC noted that Scrutiny Committee had commended JZ's work overall and asked how the six themes identified under the NSS Action Plan would be evaluated. JZ noted he is in a meeting on Thursday coming that is planning to discuss this.
- iii. CC asked NP, noting that the update regarding the College's Student Disciplinary Procedures working group stated that outcomes and sanctions applied will be shared with both reporting and responding parties in the future, whether this will be mandatory or if there will be exceptions. NP reported that the language proposed has been that the College "can and will" share outcomes with both parties unless there is a specific reason not to.
- iv. CC also asked NP re: housing whether the lobbying objective is advocating for college to provide more student housing themselves or to secure better pathways for private housing. NP confirmed it was the latter.
- v. CC noted NM's update on PG services mentioned an ambition to provide evening food services in 2023, and asked for clarification on what is being referred to. NM noted that original ambition was in relation to h-bar, which has now been put to one side for the moment: Reynolds is in process of having a refurbishment getting approved, which is hoped to be approved before the new year, and in South Kensington efforts are currently focused on improving food service in 568. NM explained the Union has been looking alternative food provision models and options for 568 in order to improve the service, with further updates to come in due course.
- vi. CC asked DH for more information on Objective 3 about improving advertising services for CSPs. DH noted this was also to do with non CSPs looking to advertise.

Questions from Council Members

- i. CO asked Scrutiny Committee a question about their scope, noting that everything that was scrutinised this time around was a manifesto point, and asked whether the OTs extensive and broad day-to-day work representing students in various meetings would be evaluated. HW noted that the next report would follow the format of previous Council reports, including general updates.
- ii. JO commented, regarding NP's objective on the review of student housing, that although it is good to review private accommodation, it would be good to review the University's accommodation system as well.
- iii. DH asked to Scrutiny Committee, where OTs have joint objectives, if the committee would like these presented in a different way. CC noted joint objectives were clear in the report received.

10. AOB

'Your Representatives to Council' webpage

YY noted that MM had raised that the webpage was outdated. CJ noted this would be updated tomorrow.

Update on the College's stance and action after the November UCU's strike

MM enquired if the College has taken any action to address the ongoing staffs' demands and asked, if the OTs do not have the latest update, to request that the OTs to share the update to the council members at the earliest convenience. JZ reported that he was not aware of any action undertaken by College to address the staff members' demands, but noted he had been in touch with Peter Haynes to get info on how many staff are on strike.

Stance on Marking Boycott

MM raised that almost half of the Council Reps abstained from voting on this question at the extraordinary Council Meeting due to insufficient information, details and uncertainties on the impacts of marking boycott in January. MM also noted that during the extraordinary meeting, it was intimated that the matter would be discussed again in the future if the Council should abstain from making a stance due to insufficient information at that point. JZ noted that any member of the union is free to submit a further motion by the paper deadline (23 Dec. 2022) to January Council for further consideration of the matter.

YY thanked everyone for their participation and closed the meeting at 8pm.