



MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS  
of the Fifth ordinary meeting of  
the **Council** of the  
Imperial College Union in the 2014/15 Session

The meeting of the Council was held in the Union Dining Hall on the 10 February at 18.00

**Present:**

Council Chair	Paul Beaumont
President	Tom Wheeler
Deputy President (Clubs & Societies)	Abi de Bruin
Deputy President (Education)	Pascal Loose
Deputy President (Finance & Services)	Alex Savell
Deputy President (Welfare)	Chris Kaye
ICSMSU President	Dariush Hassanzadeh-Baboli
CGCU President	Tim Munday
RCSU President	Serena Yuen
ACC Chair	Oliver Benton
A&E Chair	Jonathon McNaught
Media Group Chair	Cem Hurrell
RCC Chair	Richard Cameron
SCC Chair	Tom Rivlin
CAG Chair	Michael Chung
RAG Chair	Ben Fernando
ICSMSU Welfare Officer	Jennie Watson
RCSU Welfare Officer	Akash Jyoti
RSMU Welfare Officer	Rachael Shuttleworth
CGCU Academic Affairs Officer	James Murphy
ICSMSU Academic Affairs Officer – Science Years	Cyin San
GSU Physical Sciences AWO	Stuart Haylock
GSU Life Sciences AWO	Rachel Vaux
International Officer	Katherine Chio
Interfaith Officer	Shamim Ahmed
Non Faculty Ordinary Member	Philippa Skett
Engineering Ordinary Member (UG)	Lachlan Price
Engineering Ordinary Member (UG)	Oliver Ford
Engineering Ordinary Member (UG)	George Butcher
Engineering Ordinary Member (PG)	Richard Simons
Engineering Ordinary Member (PG)	Meng Guo
Natural Sciences Ordinary Member (UG)	Jasper Menkus
Natural Sciences Ordinary Member (UG)	Klas Wetterberg
Natural Sciences Ordinary Member (UG)	Philip Kent
Natural Sciences Ordinary Member (PG)	Andrew Tranter
Natural Sciences Ordinary Member (PG)	Siyuen Chen
<b>Permanent observers</b>	
Governance and Administration Manager (Clerk to Council)	Rebecca Coxhead

**Apologies:** GSU President Nida Mahmud RSMU Chair Ben Warnick CGCU Welfare Officer Juliet Kernohan Engineering Ordinary Member (UG) Ze Tan Gender Equalities Officer Madeleine Maxwell, BME Officer Shiqu Qiu Medicine Ordinary Member (PG) Abel Tesfai, GSU Business AWO Alex Derrick GSU Medicine AWO Mike Asavarut RSMU Academic Affairs Officer Emma Toms Campaigns Officer Xiaoyang Zhao LGBT Portfolio Officer Kyle Hellemans Disabilities Officer Dimitrios Karponis Ethics & Environmental Officer Rhiannon Holden

**Not present:** RCSU Academic Affairs Officer Zoe Hsu, ICSMSU Academic Affairs Officer – Early Years – Usama Asif, ICSMSU Academic Affairs Officer – Clinical Salma Haddad

# 1. TRANSPARENCY WITHIN FIRST YEAR HALLS OF RESIDENCE

RECEIVED: The paper was presented by the President

NOTED:

- a) The transparency of the information provided by College was commended.
- b) The Residential Experience Review undertaken last year gave indications that students wanted their accommodation to 'be on campus and to pay as less as possible' which is in contradiction to living in South Kensington where space is sparse and expensive.
- c) The Union has been lobbying for affordable bed spaces but accepts that this may not be able to be offered on South Kensington.
  - i. It was recognised there is the potential to 'ghettoise' students who cannot afford to live on campus and they may be stigmatised.
- d) The opportunity cost of wardening is the income forgone by having the room occupied by the wardening team however it was recognised that they pay an integral role to the halls provision.
- e) It was highlighted that the way in which students are able to pick and rank their halls and the way in which they are allocated is not ideal and has great potential for improvement for students to have more control over their preferences and ranking.
- f) It was queried as to what is College's intention to cater for the increase in student numbers in the provision to guaranteed room in halls.
  - i. It was stated that this is linked in to College's master planning process which is now considering Imperial West as a accommodation solution.
  - ii. Xenia is not included in the accommodation portfolio as College doesn't own the building however it is anticipated to continue the relationship with the company and use the space.
- g) It was questioned as to when Postgraduate Accommodation provision will become a priority for College as currently the provision is an unaffordable option for a large number of Postgraduate students.
  - i. How College communicates to Postgraduate in regards to accommodation options is poor as it does not give all options – it just promotes Grad Pad.
  - ii. Professor Humphris stated that affordable accommodation is a London wide issue and that the London Assembly could be lobbied.
- h) College should make it clear to prospective students when they are applying to Imperial just where the accommodation spaces are in relation to College and how long the commute is.
  - i. The College website will allow prospective students to have a virtual tour of rooms.
- i) It was queried that if Weeks Hall is decommissioned for accommodation, would CSP's be able to bid for the space.
- i. Weeks in its current accommodation provision is not efficient as they are extremely large rooms and as it is a listed building, what can be done to improve the space is limited.
- j) Professor Humphris stated that whatever Union Council decides upon, College will commit in in regards the Halls of Residence.
- k) Council moved to a decision on the resolves and the results are as follows:

<b>Resolve 1</b>	<b>Resolve 2</b>	<b>Resolve 3</b>
FOR 32	FOR 24	FOR 28
AGAINST 0	AGAINST 3	AGAINST 2
ABSTAIN 2	ABSTAIN 7	ABSTAIN 4
<b>Resolve 4a*</b>	<b>Resolve 5c*</b>	<b>Resolve 6</b>
FOR 18	FOR 25	FOR 30
		AGAINST 1
		ABSTAIN 3
<b>Resolve 7a*</b>	*Resolves 4a, 5C and 7a where undertaken by STV	
FOR 19		

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) **The Union supports the College's "first year guarantee" to undergraduate students and the principles behind it**
- 2) **The Union supports the College's approach of pricing to ensure that rental income covers the college's maintenance, capital and running costs for accommodation, but does not generate a surplus from student rents**
- 3) **The Union welcomes the College's intention to maintain Eastside, Southside, Beit, Wilson and Woodward as central parts of the accommodation provision.**
- 4) **The Union accepts the need to close Weeks hall and to convert this space for non-accommodation use to improve the provision of both academic and non-academic space**
- 5) **The Union does not accept any move to remove Pembridge Gardens from the First Year portfolio and mandates the President to lobby College to maintain this Hall as a part of the portfolio**
- 6) **The Union notes the challenges related to Evelyn Gardens and supports the College's efforts in exploring ways in which this could remain as part of the College's accommodation portfolio**
- 7) **The Union Welcomes the College's efforts to rebalance the rent profiles to ensure that students are able to access affordable accommodation. To this end the Union supports Proposal 1 (See appendix )**

**2. DEMOCRACY REVIEW**

RECEIVED: The paper was presented by the President

NOTED:

- a) The democratic structures should be evolved to reflect the Union's demographic.
- b) Council were asked to feed in to the review the process and seek their opinion on how to engage with members who don't ordinarily engage in the union's democratic systems.
- c) It was suggested that the timescales presented were too short.
  - i. The timeframes are based around Council to be best placed to make some changes and recommendations for the future.
- d) If all changes are recommended to be made by the 15/16 team, there is a risk that the team will not support or engage which will mean that the process will need to start again.
- e) There is an opportunity for some 'quick win' changes to be put in place this year and the proposed review gives the opportunity to look at the bigger picture and fill in some small blanks.
- f) There has been a piece of research undertaken which shows which member segments don't engage and don't know how to effect change.
- g) Statically it is known that approximately 75% oh of members engage with the Union at some level so it is how to engage the other 25%.
- h) Council moved to a vote on passing the presented Democracy Review plan and the vote is as follows:

FOR	31
AGAINST	1
ABSTAIN	1

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) **To pass the presented Democracy Review plan.**

### 3. CHAIRS BUSINESS

#### NOTED:

- a) It was ratified that the ICSMSU Constitution passed by email vote.

#### RESOLVED:

- 1) **To ratify the decision to pass the ICSMSU Constitution.**
- b) The votes that took place over email on Publishing Individual Voting Records and Having More General meetings were challenged and it was agreed that the papers be voted on again.
- c) Council moved to a vote on publishing Individual Voting records and the vote is as follows:

FOR	19
AGAINST	13
ABSTAIN	2
Passed (see appendix)	

#### RESOLVED:

- 1) **To action the Union President to make the individual votes of Council members at Council available online to members of Imperial College Union only**
- 2) **To allow the Council Chair to declare any vote a secret ballot, for example in the case of discussing an individual Union member. This is subject to the usual rules of challenging the chair.**
- 3) **To remove the Union's policy, "Motion to Publish the Voting Records of Council Members," and replace it with this policy.**
- d) Council moved to a vote on passing the motion to hold more General Meetings and the vote is as follows:

FOR	14
AGAINST	16
ABSTAIN	4
Falls	

### 4. APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEES

#### NOTED:

- a) The skills audit shaped and aligned the search.
- b) The majority of the board is student elected and they were engaged throughout the process.
- c) The paper was commended for being comprehensive.
- d) Council moved to a vote on passing the paper and the vote is as follows:

FOR	31
AGAINST	1
ABSTAIN	1
Passes	

#### RESOLVED:

- 1) **To appoint the following Trustees:**
  - **Christopher Chukwunta as Appointed Student Trustee**
  - **Neil Sachdev as Appointed Lay Trustee**
  - **Kate Owen as Appointed Lay Trustee**
  - **Jill Finney as Trustee Designate until as of 31 January 2016**

## 5. MOTION AGAINST CTSB (COUNTER TERRORISM AND SECURITY BILL) AND THE PREVENT STRATEGY

RECEIVED: The paper was presented by Jawaad Farooq

NOTED:

- a) The current PREVENT Strategy amendment goes against College's commitment to free speech.
- b) It was suggested that the amendments to the bill are counterproductive to the reasoning that the bill is trying to stop radicalisation as it creates fear and stigmatisation to Muslim students.
- c) The presented policy doesn't go against the Union's current External Speakers Policy as this has a robust approval process from both the Union and College.
  - i. The proposed amendment to the Bill is unworkable.
- d) It was agreed that the resolves need to be made specific that the Student Officers must undertake the actions in the Resolves.
- e) It was agreed to remove Resolve 9 as this already happens

RESOLVED:

**1) To remove Resolve 9 'To counter 'extreme' narrative by engaging in open dialogue and discussion while maintaining mutual respect and trust with the students and acknowledging that this is the best form of countering 'extreme' and 'radical' ideas.'**

- f) It was highlighted that the relationship with College and the Union works very well and any stance taken by the Union on the PREVENT amendments should not damage the relationship.
- g) It was agreed that the vote shall be undertaken by secret ballot. The vote results are as follows:

FOR	26
AGAINST	3
ABSTAIN	3
Passed	

RESOLVED:

**2) To pass the amended motion (see appendix )**

## 6. FOSSIL FREE: ETHICAL INVESTMENT MOTION

RECEIVED: The motion was presented by Andrea Di Biagio

NOTED:

- a) It was suggested that there is a risk to the College's investment portfolio if they do not divest in fossil fuels as divestment is a growing movement.
- b) It was highlighted that the figures stated in the appendix are outdated and that more recent information is available.
- c) Clubs, Societies and Projects have relationships with companies whose explicit purpose is to produce fossil fuels. It would be hypocritical if the Union are asking College to divest from fossil fuels yet allows the relationship with continue with its Clubs, Societies and Projects with these companies.
  - i. A substantial number of graduates go in to these companies and Postgraduate studies are funded by these so this relationship needs to be considered as important.
- d) The paper is asking for a transition to a low carbon economy and lobbying College is the first part in the process.
- e) The Deputy President Clubs & Societies stated that it would be unwise to divest from Colleges' highest earning investment when HEFCE funding has been reduced. It was responded to that the way that the fossil fuel market is going, that particular portfolio is high risk.

- f) It is important that college have an ethical investment portfolio.
- g) Council moved to a vote to accept all resolves however this fell and the resolves were voted on separately.
- h) Council moved to a vote on the resolves and the vote is as follows:
  - i. Council moved to a decision on the resolves and the results are as follows:

<b>Resolve 1</b>	<b>Resolve 2</b>	<b>Resolve 3</b>	<b>Resolve 4</b>
FOR 14	FOR 11	FOR 14	FOR 26
AGAINST 13	AGAINST 15	AGAINST 12	AGAINST 4
ABSTAIN 4	ABSTAIN 3	ABSTAIN 5	ABSTAIN 0
Passes	Falls	Passes	Passes

**See appendix for policy.**

## **7. FAIRTRADE POLICY**

RECEIVED: The paper was presented by the Deputy President (Welfare)

NOTED:

- a) The lapsed policy has been updated to reflect the change to the Liberation Officers remits.
- b) Council expressed their opinion that Fairtrade may not be the best accreditation for the Union to be seeking. There are other alternative ethical accreditations that the Union could be affiliated to rather than Fairtrade specifically.
- c) It was highlighted that College's Fairtrade accreditation relies on the Union leading the process.
- d) It was suggested that the paper be withdrawn and a working group be set up to discuss what other accreditation options there are.

**ACTION:**

- 1. The Deputy President (Welfare) to set up a Working Group to discuss Ethical Accreditation alternatives.**

## **8. FEMALE SANITARY PRODUCTS MOTION**

RECEIVED: The motion was presented by the Deputy President (Welfare)

NOTED:

- a) These would be the only product that would will be sold at cost.
- b) The decrease on revenue has been discussed with the Managing Director and Retail Manager.
- c) Council moved to a vote on accepting the motion and the vote is as follows:
  - FOR 29
  - AGAINST 0
  - ABSTAIN 2
  - Passed (see appendix)

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) To mandate the Deputy President (Welfare) to work with the Union's management team on providing feminine hygiene products for sale in the Union's outlets at a 0% profit margin.**
- 2) To mandate the Deputy President (Welfare) to communicate this provision to students once it is implemented.**
- 3) To mandate the Deputy President (Welfare) to investigate avenues for the provision of feminine hygiene products outside of shop opening hours on campus, lobbying the College as necessary.**

## 9. MOTION TO LOBBY COLLEGE FOR A DEFINITIVE LUNCH HOUR

RECEIVED: The paper was presented by Shamin Ahmed

NOTED:

- a) It was queried as to how far the Union should go in lobbying for all religious observations to be recognised.
- b) The knock on effect to timetabling catering outlets and space need to be considered.
- c) The paper is asking to lobby College to ensure that lecture recordings are compulsory.
- d) There is there a potential to start the day at .08.00 and finish at 19.00 if a compulsory lunch hour is lobbied for.
- e) Colleges' Operation Excellence programme to discuss space is starting soon.
- f) It was agreed to change the title of the paper to Preservation of Religious Observance.
- g) Council moved to a vote on accepting the resolves and the vote is as follows:

Resolve 1	Resolve 2	Resolve 3
FOR 19	For 28	For 26
Against 9	Against 3	Against 2
Abstain 4	Abstain 1	Abstain 4
Passes	Passes	Passes

## 9. TRUSTEES REPORTS

RECEIVED: The report was presented by the Council Chair

NOTED:

- a) It was requested that a summary of the sub committees of Board be included in the next report.

***At this point the meeting was deemed inquorate and the Officer Trustee reports could not be considered.***

Meeting closed 21.40

Approved as a correct record at a meeting of Union Council

on \_\_\_\_\_ 2014/15

\_\_\_\_\_ Chair of the Meeting

## APPENDIX

### Stance on Transparency within First-Year Halls of Residence

#### Introduction

As previously mentioned in Council Reports, I have had some preliminary discussions with the Vice Provost (Education) and the Chief Financial Officer at College regarding transparency in the Halls of Residence piece.

#### Amenities Fund

As covered in the separate paper to Council, the Amenities Fund is an additional contribution on top of the Rent that students pay, which is ring-fenced and administered by the Union, and controlled by Hall Committee's (with Union oversight and support).

#### Breakdown of Rent

The following costs do not include the capital cost of land, and assume that this land is effectively free. A year in Halls of Residence is 39 weeks. "Wardening" is the opportunity cost of not renting wardens' rooms.

**Table 1: Breakdown of Rent**

Element	Total Annual (39 weeks)	Weekly per bed space
Staff	£442,000	£4.70
Cleaning	£1,182,000	£12.50
Facilities Management	£293,000	£3.10
Utilities	£1,241,000	£13.20
Wardening (opportunity cost)	£795,000	£8.40
Other	£697,000	£7.40
Ongoing Maintenance	£1,490,000	£15.80
Capital Costs	£8,924,659	£94.60
Long-term Maintenance (average)	£1,037,751	£11.00
<b>TOTAL AVG. COST</b>	<b>£16,104,009</b>	<b>£170.70</b>
<b>TOTAL AVG. RENT</b>	<b>£15,660,606</b>	<b>£166.00</b>
<i>(Difference)</i>	<i>-£443,403</i>	<i>-£4.70</i>

#### Principles

For reference, College applies the following principles to its "First Year Guarantee". College will guarantee to provide comfortable, safe, fairly priced accommodation within reasonable commuting distance of the South Kensington campus for all first year undergraduates. This is known as the "first year guarantee". Colleges "first year guarantee" accommodation does not run for profit, however it also doesn't make losses.

#### Postgraduate accommodation

Postgraduate accommodation (and in particular GradPad) is not discussed in this report, as College runs GradPad for profit. The Union has already opposed the high expense of GradPad.

#### Individual Room Rent

As stated above, the costs of land is not included in the rent paid by students for beds in halls. This throws up the question of how to fairly represent the less desirable option/inconvenience of living off-campus, and how to reflect this financially in the price of individual rent. Below is the current average rent per bed:

#### Garden and Weeks Hall

On 22 February 2013, College Management Board (now Provost Board) made the promise that [before the closure of Garden and Evelyn, a consultation will occur](#). This has not occurred, and Garden Hall has closed. No mention of the ongoing use of Weeks was made in February 2013, however renovation will cause significant increase in rent. A current plan is that the new space in North Prince's Gardens will increase the childcare provision.



**Table 2: Current average rents per hall**

Hall	Average Weekly rent/person	Number of beds	m <sup>2</sup> /person	Rent/m <sup>2</sup>	Rent/m <sup>2</sup> compared Eastside	Travel time to SK
Beit	£169	313	11.9	£14.24	91%	5
Eastside	£191	454	12.3	£15.58	100%	5
Southside	£174	407	11.8	£14.71	94%	5
Weeks	£156	64	14.4	£10.84	70%	5
Pembridge	£127	96	11.5	£11.07	71%	20
Wilson	£153	393	10.3	£14.86	95%	15
Woodward	£158	692	13.2	£11.95	77%	30
<b>Total/Avg.</b>	<b>£166</b>	<b>2419</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>£13.72</b>	<b>88%</b>	

Below are proposals to reflect the difference in appeal of Eastside to Woodward, and create more affordable bed spaces, however this will lead to an increase in cost of on-campus accommodation. Note that Woodward Hall is Acton.

**Table 3: Proposal 1**

Hall	Average Weekly rent/person	Number of beds	m <sup>2</sup> /person	Rent/m <sup>2</sup>	Rent/m <sup>2</sup> compared Eastside	Travel time to SK
Beit	£182	313	11.9	£15.29	87%	5
Eastside	£215	454	12.3	£17.48	100%	5
Southside	£200	407	11.8	£16.95	97%	5
Weeks	£170	64	14.4	£11.81	68%	5
Pembridge	£130	96	11.5	£11.30	65%	20
Wilson	£150	393	10.3	£14.56	83%	15
Woodward	£120	692	13.2	£9.09	52%	30
<b>Total/Avg.</b>	<b>£166</b>	<b>2419</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>£13.72</b>	<b>88%</b>	

Below are proposals with Eastside to Woodward at a 2:1 ratio:

**Table 4: Proposal 2**

Hall	Average Weekly rent/person	Number of beds	m <sup>2</sup> /person	Rent/m <sup>2</sup>	Rent/m <sup>2</sup> compared Eastside	Travel time to SK
Beit	£191	313	11.9	£16.09	91%	5
Eastside	£215	454	12.3	£17.59	100%	5
Southside	£196	407	11.8	£16.56	94%	5
Weeks	£176	64	14.4	£12.25	70%	5
Pembridge	£113	96	11.5	£9.80	56%	20
Wilson	£157	393	10.3	£15.21	86%	15
Woodward	£118	692	13.2	£8.88	50%	30
<b>Total/Avg.</b>	<b>£166</b>	<b>2419</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>£13.72</b>	<b>78%</b>	

## **Publishing individuals' votes at Council**

*Author:* George Butcher (Ordinary Council Member, CGCU)

*Seconded by:* Tom Wheeler (Union President) and Andrew Tranter (Natural Science Ordinary Member)

### Union Notes

1. On the 10<sup>th</sup> December 2013 the Union Council committed:
  - a. To record and publish an account of how each council member votes in council, on a per-item basis, on the union website.
  - b. To commit to enacting the previous resolution in time for the next 2 meeting of council.
2. On the 28<sup>th</sup> October 2014 Council voted to
  - a. "Uphold the resolves of the previous paper, as agreed on December 10, 2013"
  - b. "Action George Butcher to form a working group, discuss the options possible and report back to Council"

### Union Believes

1. That council members have been elected to represent its members views and that they are accountable to those members
2. Publishing the votes of individuals encourages Council members to vote for Union members and accurately represent their views in policy

### Union Resolves

1. To action the Union President to make the individual votes of Council members at Council available online to members of Imperial College Union only
2. To allow the Council Chair to declare any vote a secret ballot, for example in the case of discussing an individual Union member. This is subject to the usual rules of challenging the chair.
3. To remove the Union's policy, "Motion to Publish the Voting Records of Council Members," and replace it with this policy

## Motion against CTSB (Counter Terrorism and Security Bill) and the Prevent strategy by Imperial College London Student Union

**Proposer: Jawaad Farooq**

**Secunder: Nida Mahmud, Shamim Ahmed**

### **This Union Notes:**

1. On 26 November 2014, the Home Secretary Theresa May introduced the Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill (CTSB) to Parliament highlighting some revised and new counter-terrorism powers that would be placed on a statutory basis.
2. That Student Unions including those of SOAS, UCL KCL, QM and LSE have all passed motions condemning and disassociating itself with the CTS Bill and the Prevent Strategy, deeming the latter to be a failed and counter-productive policy.
3. The Union currently carries out speaker approval and event monitoring scheme set in place to see that external speakers and events comply with union regulation by working with student societies, campus security and college. Whilst not run under the PREVENT strategy, the procedure is currently sufficient to maintain the confidence of the local police force in the College and Union combatting extreme radical views on campus.
4. **The new bill seeks to impose:**
  - a) That CTSB seeks to make the controversial PREVENT and CHANNEL strategies statutory upon institutes of higher education such as universities.
  - b) The duty upon staff and lecturers to actively keep an eye out for potential 'radicalisation' and 'extremism' on campus amongst students and work colleagues.
  - c) To vet every speaker by demanding material to be presented for scrutiny to the College beforehand and giving the PREVENT officer/team in contact with the university the final say on what to accept or reject as appropriate.
  - d) A broad ranging set of powers to authorities based on poorly defined terms and categories, which may impact civil liberties and basic human rights.
5. **Implications/concerns with the bill**
  - a) Universities UK have expressed concerns about academic freedom in their parliamentary briefing on the counter terrorism and security bill.
  - b) Former chief of MI5 and the current chairman of Imperial College London, Eliza Manningham-Buller has condemned the bill with concerns of it suppressing the very values 'we are seeking to protect' and that we should avoid 'double standards'.
  - c) That the PREVENT strategy guidance in 2011 stated that university staff, lecturers and chaplains should report to the police any Muslim students who are isolated or depressed, thereby creating a culture of fear and stigmatisation surrounding Muslim students.
  - d) That according to the current Prevent Strategy, potential indicators of "radicalism" or "extremism" include:  
"A need for identity, meaning and belonging."  
"A desire for political or moral change."  
"Relevant mental health issues."
  - e) That the bill will mean the Union and College lose their internal control over what events are run on campus.

### **The Union Believes:**

1. The Counter Terrorism and Security Bill discourages the free expression and analysis of ideas.
2. The monitoring and exclusion of ideas from public debate opposes a basic function of universities: introducing students to a variety of opinions and encouraging them to analyse and debate them.

3. That the best way to counter 'extreme' narrative is to expose it through academic discourse at Imperial.
4. That while the further expectations from the student unions not only violate liberty and fundamental human rights, they also create unrealistic expectations of what students unions, lecturers and public institutions are expected to monitor and thus, just considering the notion logistically, one must conclude that it is unworkable.
5. That by risking the ability of a scope of events taking place from controversial speakers to student led events, the bill will simply drive certain activities off campus where they are currently held and regulated and as such any radical elements will be allowed to flourish unchecked without oversight that is now currently in place.

**This Union Resolves:**

1. That Imperial College Union (ICU) supports an enquiry into the legality of the proposals under the Equality Act 2010 and the Education Act No. 2 1986.
2. That ICU should issue a public statement condemning the PREVENT strategy and the government's Counter Terrorism and Security bill.
3. For Student Officers to work with campus trade unions on combatting the PREVENT strategy and lobby them to condemn the Counter terrorism and Security bill.
4. That ICU will issue a formal statement to the college regarding PREVENT, asserting it to be a failed strategy with a counter-productive approach to tackling the issue of people being drawn into terrorism, and urge the university to reassess its ties with PREVENT.
5. That Student Officers should lobby local MPs urging them to speak out against the PREVENT policy, lobby to change the official understanding on the causes of radicalisation and subsequently change the approach PREVENT takes in its counter radicalisation measures.
6. Student Officers to document all cases of any perceived abuse or intimidation reported by individuals as a consequence of PREVENT policies on campus and support those students through the relevant channels.
7. To mandate the Student officers to report on how PREVENT, CHANNEL and other similar initiatives are attempting to engage with the university and vice versa.
8. That ICU will educate students and help initiatives by students to educate and debate on the dangers that the counter terrorism and security bill (CTSB) and the PREVENT Strategy pose to academic freedom and individual liberties of the student body.

## **Female Sanitary Products Motion**

**Proposer:** Deputy President (Welfare) Christopher Kaye

**Seconded:** Claire Cooper (Geology MSci)

### Notes

1. That feminine hygiene products are a necessary expense for most female students
2. That the Union shop needs, in general, to sell products at a profit margin to ensure that overheads are met and that a surplus is generated to fund student activities, representation and welfare services.
3. That Shop Extra current sells feminine hygiene products at a profit margin of 30% and generates a gross surplus of c. £600 per annum from the sale of these products.

### Believes

1. That feminine hygiene products are a necessary expense for most female students
2. That the Union should provide the items at the lowest possible price for students.

### Resolves

1. To mandate the Deputy President (Welfare) to work with the Union's management team on providing feminine hygiene products for sale in the Union's outlets at a 0% profit margin.
2. To mandate the Deputy President (Welfare) to communicate this provision to students once it is implemented.
3. To mandate the Deputy President (Welfare) to investigate avenues for the provision of feminine hygiene products outside of shop opening hours on campus, lobbying the College as necessary.

## **Fossil Free: Ethical Investment**

Proposer: Andrea Di Biagio (Mathematics PG)  
Seconder: Andrew Benton (Centre of Environmental Policy PG)

### **Union Notes**

1. Climate scientists have accumulated unambiguous evidence that human activities mainly in the form of greenhouse gas emission are, by far, the leading cause of climate change [1][2].
2. The adverse effects of climate change are already impacting the livelihoods of people around the globe. Continued emissions will increase the likelihood severe, pervasive and irreversible impacts for people and ecosystems[1][2].
3. Recent research indicates fossil fuel companies plan to extract an amount of carbon which is radically incompatible with all scientific evidence for the emission requirements for a safe environment[3]. Extracting more than 20% of known reserves is incompatible with a safe climate[4].
4. Imperial's endowment, one of the largest in the UK, is currently invested directly and indirectly in many companies holding the largest reserves of fossil fuels for a total of £7.7million[5][6].
5. Divestment of capital from the fossil fuel industry has been proposed as a way of moving the economy towards a sustainable energy future and a safe environment[7]. Divestment has had positive impact in the campaign against tobacco companies and the South Africa apartheid[7].
6. Fossil Free Indexes were found to be performing indistinguishably from the common indexes. Furthermore, the fluctuations in oil price and the risk of stranded assets makes fossil fuel companies a risky investment[8]. Thus, divesting capital from the fossil fuels industry and reinvesting it in fossil free titles does not only conceivably come at no cost, but would represent a financially safer option.
7. Private funds as the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and universities such as Stanford and University of Glasgow are among the hundreds of individuals, funds and organisations having pledged divestment[9][10][11].
8. Students at Imperial have showed strong agreement to the divestment movement, as showed by the large growing number of petition signatories [12] and the fact that the Fossil Free Imperial campaign is one of the few causes supported by the student body.

### **Union Believes**

1. Climate change is arguably the most important issue of the century, and action is needed.
2. Imperial's actions, as a leading research institution should be in accordance to the best scientific understanding.
3. Imperial should recognise the responsibility it has towards the people and the country.
4. The lack of an Ethical Investment Policy is not fit for a public institution like Imperial.
5. Divestment from fossil fuel companies can be done by experts in a financially sound way.
6. Divestment from fossil fuel companies can be done without necessarily harming Imperial' research.
7. Imperial would improve the student satisfaction by listening to students' opinion on matters that regard their future, especially if this is backed by evidence.
8. Although climate change is a complex problem and there is no fix-all solution, divestment is a powerful ethical yet financially sound way for Imperial of promoting the climate discussion and furthering climate mitigation.

### **Union Resolves**

1. To recognise that, although climate change is a complex problem and there is no fix-all solution, divestment is a powerful ethical yet financially sound way for Imperial of promoting the climate discussion and furthering climate mitigation.
2. To engage with the endowment board with regards to the divestment movement.
3. To ask college to develop an ethical investment policy for protecting the interests of present and future students.

## Preservation of Religious Observance

**Proposer:** Shamim Ahmed (Interfaith Officer)

**Seconders:** Christopher Kaye - Deputy President (Welfare), Alex Savell – Deputy President (Finance & Services)

### The Union Notes:

1. Lunch-hour/s across campus range from 12-2pm; some departments/faculties only accommodate lunch from 1-2pm
2. No specific time for Lunch stipulated by college which is applicable to all departments and faculties
3. Imperial College is committed to religious tolerance, understanding and co-operation and every effort is made to meet the practical needs of staff and students whatever their faith background.
4. Ensure that students are not disadvantaged due to religious commitments
5. Many religious practices are taking place during lunch-times
  - *Thursday lunchtime - Roman Catholic Mass - 1-2 pm*
  - *Friday lunchtime - Muslim Prayer Time - 1-2 pm<sup>1</sup>*
  - *Friday afternoons (Autumn and Winter) - Jewish Sabbath<sup>2</sup>*
6. It is an obligation upon Muslims to perform the congregational Friday prayers during Friday lunchtime
7. It is an obligation upon Jews to begin preparations on Friday afternoon for the Sabbath holiday
8. Many observant Jews have been unable to attend lectures/laboratories on Friday evenings due to faith commitments.

### The Union Believes:

1. Improve the provision of information to the College community in respect of the academic timetable.
2. It is important for students to be free to fulfill their religious obligations without being at any disadvantage in their academic studies.
3. That according to the Clubs & Societies policy\*, the Union has a duty to ensure that resources are provided for welfare needs
4. That students should have the right and access to provisions to practise their religion.

### The Union Resolves:

1. To lobby the College to stipulates a definite Lunch period from 1-2pm for both Staff and Student timetables.
2. To lobby the College and other relevant bodies on behalf of Muslim and Jewish students to protect periods for religious observance, including Friday lunchtime (1-2pm) for Muslim Friday service and Friday afternoons (Autumn and Winter) for the Jewish Sabbath by providing suitable alternatives such as lecture recordings etc.
3. To lobby the College to take steps to ensure students who are unable to attend due to religious obligations are not disadvantaged. These alternatives may include: the provision of repeat sessions; making electronic recordings available on the relevant virtual learning environment; making available alternative learning materials, ensuring Labs sessions are avoided on Friday evenings in the Winter<sup>3</sup>.

\* **Clubs & Societies Policy**, point 10 of section B (DUTIES OF THE UNION AND CLUBS & SOCIETIES)

10. The Union shall provide a safe environment, free from harassment and discrimination for all Union activity (according to the Health & Safety and Equal Opportunities Policies). The above point refers to the Health and Safety policy; point 4 is of particular interest:

4. Imperial College Union acknowledges its duty to ensure that all relevant legislation regarding health, safety and **welfare is adhered to and that resources are made available to ensure health, safety and welfare.**

---