



MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS

The first ordinary meeting of the Union Council

The meeting of Union Council was held on Tuesday 8th October at 18:30 in RSMG01, Royal School of Mines

Present

| Role | Name |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Council Chair | Lloyd James (Chair/LJ) |
| 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) |
| Deputy President (Finance and Services) | Fi-Fi Henry (FH) |
| 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) |
| Culture Sector Chair | Shuning Xu (SX) |
| Ethics and Environment Officer | Francesca Siracusa (FS) |
| Gender Equality Officer | Soo-Jeong Kim (SJK) |
| GSU President | Mohit Devgan (MD) |
| GSU Vice President (Representation) | Milia Hasbani (MH) |
| ICSMSU President | Benjamin Russell (BR) |

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| ICSMSU Academic Chair | Waseem Hassan (WH) |
| Interfaith Officer | Amna Ahmed (AA) |
| LGBT Officer | Freya Hepworth Lloyd (FHL) |
| RCSU President | Alex Auyang (AAu) |
| RCSU Vice President (Education) | Michaela Flegrova (MF) |
| RCSU Welfare Officer | Peter Hull (PH) |
| Recreation Sector Chair | Christopher Turner (CT) |
| RSMSU President | Christopher Carter (CC) |
| RSMSU Vice President (Education) | Alexandre de Saint Germain (ASG) |
| RSMSU Welfare Officer | Arman Sarjou (ASa) |
| GSU Postgraduate Research Academic & Welfare Officer (Engineering) | Raya El Laham |
| Sports Sector Chair | Ross Unwin (RU) |
| Felix Editor | Henry Alman (Observing) |

Apologies:

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Mental Health Officer | Ambika Bharadwaj |
| | |
| | |

Absent:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|
| Community and Faith Sector Chair | Jack Lee |
| ICSMSU Welfare Officer | Jack Hall |
| | |
| | |

| Item | Actions |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Chair's welcome and Chair's business.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair welcomed the Council to the first meeting of the 2019/20 session. No Chair's business. | |
| <p>2. Apologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ambika Bharadwaj | |
| <p>3. Introduction to Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair gave an overview of the function and proceedings of the council in order to get all members up to speed, especially for those whom this would be their first meeting. Chair also gave an overview of the sub-committees of UC and their basic remit. Chair reminded UC of the training session on 4th Nov (day before UC meet on 5th Nov). Gave a brief overview of Board of Trustees and its function. Chair expanded to outline what is expected of UC members, namely, how they can engage with the UC, what kind of issues are brought before UC, and so on. | |
| <p>4. Ratification of Standing Orders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair summarised the motion and appendices as tabled. Chair noted that the goal of streamlining the standing orders (meaning in this case the removal of redundant language) of UC and its sub-committees makes them a lot more accessible for UC and student body; allowing for better decision-making. Chair then drew UC's attention to a few further small amendments proposed for the standing orders, which were proposed by MH. Chair invited questions. SS noted that they believed standing orders for CWB had already been changed, and that section 2.d of CWB's standing orders should specify a 'liberation and community officer' rather than a 'representative of halls of residence'. SS also noted that section 4.a of CWB's standing orders is void as SS believes CWB does not have any budget allocation powers. MH noted the same issue with section 4.a of ERB's standing orders. MH further believed it should be clarified that any budget allocation powers that these sub-committees may have is separate from the annual budgeting undertaken by ICU. Chair clarified that the intention of these powers was to allow a CU who were unable to claim budgeting during ICU's annual budget allocation | <p>LJ to Strike section 4.a. from sub-committee</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>to instead lobby for funding through sub-committees as appropriate. Chair however noted that they were unaware if this funding capability had actually been made available. UC noted that there is a lack of clarity on how budgets and funding are allocated. Chair Suggested to strike lines regarding budget allocation from section 4.a. of standing orders for ERB CWB, and ask for Board to discuss and clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council then discussed membership of UC's sub-committees, making suggestions for how best to specify membership. TC cautioned against reducing CU members on these sub-committees, worried that it would reduce the voice of CUs. TC asked for a vote to stop UC from ratifying standing orders today as they stand, because the UC is not fully populated (awaiting results from AE19) and contains members who are new and inexperienced. MF responded that despite their being new members on UC, they are still able to make meaningful contributions and decisions. • Committee agreed that it would be ideal for there to be one or two welfare reps from each CU present in each sub-committee. SS notes that membership should be worded so that CU welfare reps who are unable to attend due to workload will be able to delegate / other CU welfare reps can take part. Various configurations were discussed. • AS suggests that since SS is chair of CWB, then UC can leave him to specify membership. UC. AB, FH and TFD to do the same with their respective sub-committees • MH asked for the justification for splitting CSPB into SHE and SPB. TFD responded that there will be a review of SHE and SPB and their remits (touched upon earlier). TFD notes the previous paper that UC passed last academic year contains the clarification that MH desires, however CSPB will meet once this year before splitting into SPB and SHE. TFD assures he will bring an update and clarification to the next UC meet. MH notes that this change has not been reflected in the current bye-laws. • MH noted that where standing orders mentions 'issues', it would be more appropriate to use the word 'matters' instead. • AS praised LJ for his work in streamlining and updating the standing orders. | <p>standing orders, and broach issue with Board.</p> <p>Sub-committee chairs to discuss and specify their membership at their first meeting.</p> <p>TFD to update UC on CSPB splitting into SHE / SPB to next meet.</p> <p>AS/LJ to update bye-laws to reflect change in CSP sub-committees.</p> <p>RB to replace 'issues' with 'matters' in</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair then gave a brief overview of the new voting system in use by UC (Mentimeter) – • motion passed – 23 for, 1 against, 2 abstain. | standing orders. |
| <p>5. Proposal for a new external trustee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS summarised the paper as tabled. AS noted this paper was brought by Rob and Chippy (last years president and council chair respectively), due to difficulty with getting proper attendance from external trustees. Invited questions. No questions. • Waseem Hassan (ICSMSU Acad. Chair) joined the meeting. • Motion Passed – 23 For, 1 against, 3 abstain (2/3 majority required) | |
| <p>6. Ratification of student trustees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS summarised the proposal as tabled. • Committee noted MH, as one of the newly appointed trustees must not take part in the vote. • AS Clarified that this motion is not to do with the idea of appointing student trustees itself, which can be brought as a separate motion. • AS then outlined the function of an appointed student trustee within Board, and summarised the rationale given to appoint JX and MH i.e. what positives they showed during the interview process etc. Invited Questions. None. Moved to vote. • Both motions Passed – Milia Hasbani’s appointment ratified with 24 for, 0 against, 2 abstain. Jinpo Xiang’s appointment ratified with 23 for, 1 against, 2 abstain. | |
| <p>7. Chair’s report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair summarised report as tabled. Invited questions. MH and JOD asked for a clarification of the policy update – will sub-committees be able to make their own amendments or must they still be ratified by UC? Chair responded that at the next UC, council will approve the new set of policies, and thereafter only certain policies will be delegated to sub-committees; those policies will be specific to their remit, and do not require UC approval to amend. But some policies will still need direct approval by UC. | |
| <p>8. President’s report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS summarised the report as tabled. Invited questions. None. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>9. DPE report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB summarised the report as tabled. Invited questions. TC asks how AB responds to the fact that ICU has a low NSS score compared to IC itself – TC believes ICU should be addressing its own score before advising IC. AB responds that the NSS working group is actively involved in addressing this. AB further noted that there is often a misunderstanding – students often don't realise academic reps and associated representation and support processes are managed through the union (and not IC) and have a hugely positive impact. This feeds into AB's intention to make the student body aware of ICU's work in academic representation. | |
| <p>10. DPW Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MH left the meeting. • SS summarised the report as tabled. Invited Questions. MF and ASG questioned the dates of Rep Academy – could SS address why they had not seen any communication pertaining to this event, such as dates. SS provided clarification on the scope of rep academy and its intents, and apologised that it had not been promoted properly and assured UC that emails will be going out next week with full details. • SS emphasised that this is a new initiative to improve Academic Rep training, and therefore welcomed ongoing feedback from UC members. | |
| <p>11. DPCS Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TFD summarised the report as tabled. Invited questions. WH commented on issues with the room booking platform. TFD outlined that there is a short-staffing issue currently which is creating a backlog. TFD noted also the relationship between IC and ICU means that bureaucratic delays can occur whilst the two organisations negotiate over room booking space for the coming year. • RU asked if TFD has been affected by the lack of staff. (Specifically staff to deal with sports clubs activities). TFD clarified as above. Chair asked to clarify on goal 5 on report – TFD responded that there are ongoing activities with both ICU and IC in engaging students with committees; it appears as 'watch this space' on the report as meaningful outcomes will not be available until the 19/20 year is fully underway. | |
| <p>12. DPFS report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FH summarised the report as tabled. Invited volunteers to see her after meet for Fusion new menu tasting on 7th Nov. Invited questions. | |

- Chair asked two questions that were submitted to the Chair by MH:
 - i. MH requested clarifications on the next steps regarding a food service at H-bar. FH at start of Sep it was planned that there would be a evening food service in H bar. Issues not spotted by ICU staff means H bar currently not equipped to deliver food service, and since it is owned by IC, negotiations are needed between ICU and IC regarding who would be responsible for resourcing and maintenance of the equipment needed for food services. FH also notes large number of vacancies currently within commercial services. Therefore food in H bar is on hold until above issues are solved. Issue is in hand, and will be examined by Board. MH also asked if there would be a reduced menu as a stopgap. FH responded that a reduced menu still would require the same amount of resourcing, so no point offering a reduced menu (it's a goal to offer students the best service and not do half measures.
 - ii. MH concerned inter-halls sustainability challenge – from MH's perspective students in halls are not aware of this initiative. FH clarified that this project has not started yet, so issues such as engagement from students in halls are in hand and updates will be available.
- RU noted that there was no visibility regarding this initiative on external campuses. FH replied that they checked campuses personally and made sure materials are there, but conceded that there is nothing on the website. Hence the deadline for applications will be extended.
- MD – asked if the summer ball is UG-focused, or if there is scope for PG students to provide input. FH answered yes, but noted that due to operational considerations that it is not an open consultative process, however PG engagement is a priority so such input in this case would be welcome – overall the priority is to have a process with meaningful input without making it too open and subsequently slow and ineffective.
- JOD noted that PG input is a long term goal to ensure that summer ball caters to the whole student body.
- RU asked that since there was a PG summer ball last year, will this not happen this year? MD noted that last year's summer ball was successful, however the issue was there is a clash with ICU's own summer ball which frustrated efforts to develop it. Idea is to instead make it a 'winter ball' to avoid such clashes. AB added that

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>being in the PG summer ball was a great experience for those involved, so having them as separate events may be the best way forward. MD agreed, and added that this tied back to their earlier question of whether ICU can give resource to support having two summer balls. Chair noted that this a perfect item for SSB to consider. FH clarified that ICU will not have staff dedicated to organising summer ball this year, so MD should be aware of that regarding resourcing for two separate summer balls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS noted that he is on hand to assist MD to navigate resourcing from ICU, given that this process will not be so straightforward. • JOD asked if FH considered the Welcome Week events were successful compared to last year. FH responded that big events were less successful than last year due to issues with security and new staff lacking experience and preparation for Welcome Week. Also there was confusion with marketing regarding one of the events (students thought it was cancelled when it wasn't). By no means did FH consider the Welcome Week events a failure but there are definite areas for improvement. • ASa noted that they had received negative feedback regarding security being too harsh on students. FH says they will assess the services used for security week after next (since that is when their current agreement to supply security services lapses). | |
| <p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JOD asked AS about the level of staff turnover ICU is currently experiencing – what is the scope of the issue, and what steps are being taken to address this? AS noted that PARC is examining this issue right now and working through the problems that high turnover points to. External Trustees are also putting pressure on ICU to solve this issue this year, and so progress can be expected, and AS will endeavour to be as frank as possible when giving updates of this nature to UC. | |
| <p>Next meeting: 5th November 18:30 – RSMG01 (RSM)</p> | |