CUSU COUNCIL LENT II MINUTES – 6TH FEBRUARY 2017

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT

Rachel Mander, CUSU Chair
Mark McCormack, CUSU General Manager
Alex Cicale, CUSU Democratic Support Co-ordinator (Scribe)

Amatey Doku, CUSU President
Audrey Sebatindira, CUSU Women’s Officer*

Nancy Thorpe, Christ’s JCR, Vice-President*
James Burn, Christ’s JCR, President*
Tom Meadows, Downing JCR, President*
Keir Murison acting as proxy for Tom George, Emmanuel JCR, Vice-President*
Amy Botwright acting as proxy for Toby Matimong, Homerton JCR, Vice-President (External)*
Katherine Boucher, Jesus JCR, President*
Kirsty McKnight acting as proxy for Vicky Taylor, Jesus JCR, Vice-President*
Bethany Bartlett, Newnham JCR, Vice-President*
Zach Berenson Barros, Pembroke JCR, Vice-President*
Jason Okundaye, Pembroke JCR, President*
Alex Lawrence, Peterhouse JCR, Vice-President*
Rebecca Robinson, Peterhouse JCR, President*
Hope Whitehead acting as proxy for Joseph Levin, Queens’ JCR, President*
Ben Collins acting as proxy for Sam Dixon, Queens’ JCR, Vice-President*
Emma Harper, Selwyn JCR, Vice-President*
Alex Ho, St Catharine’s College JCR, External Officer*
Mira Nadarajah, Trinity Hall JCR, President*
Jennie Towler, Trinity Hall JCR, Vice-President*

Nicholas Langford, Hughes Hall MCR, Vice-President*
Rachel Crosby, Newnham MCR, External*
Ivanna Didur, Robinson MCR, Vice-President (External)*
Sebastian Wrobel, Wolfson College Students’ Association, External Officer*

Nadine Batchelor-Hunt, BME Campaign, President*
Tom Ashford, LGBT+ Autonomous Campaign, President*
Louis Ashworth, Varsity
Caitlin Smith, Varsity
2.

CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES OF THE LAST COUNCIL MEETING

None

3.

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST COUNCIL MEETING

None

4.

DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF UPCOMING COUNCIL MEETINGS

• The next Council will be held on the 20th of February 2017 from 7pm to 9pm in the same venue (the Cormack Room, University Centre).

5.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY COMMITTEES, CAMPAIGN TEAMS AND THE EXECUTIVE

• Éireann Attridge, CUSU Access and Funding Officer (in absentia): The Shadowing Scheme has been going really well and I am thankful to the JCR Access Officers who have been helping me with it.

• Jessica Wing, CUSU Disabled Students’ Officer:

  - Opened submissions for ‘In Camouflage’, a zine on the intersection of autism and gender.
  - Met with Géraldine Dufour, head of the University Counselling Service, to discuss potential changes to the pre-counselling form.
  - Attended a briefing on acting as a student assessor for the University complaints procedure.
  - Attended a meeting with the Students’ Union’s Advice Service to discuss the role of sabbatical officers in casework.
  - Analysed survey responses and finalised a draft of a best practice paper for colleges on support for undergraduate students on intermission.
  - Finished the Disabled Students’ Campaign Guide to Undergraduate Intermission, outside of incorporating final comments from various staff and the DSC committee. Barring complications this should be online very soon.
  - Met with Géraldine Dufour, head of the University Counselling Service, to discuss potential changes to the pre-counselling form.
  - Attended a briefing on acting as a student assessor for the University complaints procedure.
- Attended a meeting with the Students’ Union’s Advice Service to discuss the role of sabbatical officers in casework.
- Analysed survey responses and finalised a draft of a best practice paper for colleges on support for undergraduate students on intermission.
- Finished the Disabled Students’ Campaign Guide to Undergraduate Intermission, outside of incorporating final comments from various staff and the DSC committee. Barring complications this should be online very soon.
- Attended the University Counselling Service Executive Committee. Discussion focused on the development of centralised guidance for college-based counsellors, which makes confidentiality and boundaries a clear focus, along with providing guidance to students on making complaints and reminding them of their ability to pursue complaints with the counsellor’s accrediting body. Changes to the UCS pre-counselling form were also discussed, along with the 2015-2016 annual report.
- Attended meeting regarding planning the CUSU Garden Party.
- Continued involvement in the CUSU Shadowing Scheme.

• Roberta Huldisch, CUSU Education Officer:
  - Represented students on the following committees
    - General Board Education Committee
    - Sports Committee
  - Planned the Liberate My Degree Week with Audrey - panels, events, publicity
  - Produced and disseminated publicity material for the Student Led Teaching Awards
  - Ran two evening events for the CUSU Shadowing Scheme
  - Helped coordinate the NUS by-election and attended meetings with Elections Committee
  - Kept coordinating the NSS boycott
  - Began organising the CUSU Garden Party
  - Attended a meeting with the Advice Service
  - Attended a presentation of the Student Barometer pilot results
  - Prepared for the Learning and Teaching Reviews of the Faculties of English and Materials Science
  - Organised supervision & feedback student focus groups

• Audrey Sebatindira, CUSU Women’s Officer (as outlined in her Womcam email):
  - Continued planning for Reclaim the Night and began designing T-shirts and organising stewards
  - Organised the Cambridge protest against Trump’s Muslim ban
  - Attended sabb meetings
  - Interviewed by Varsity about sexual harassment on campus
  - Met with students to discuss rise in Islamophobic hate crime post-Trump and Brexit
  - Attended trustee board meetings
  - Met with the Cambridge Union Society women’s officer to discuss WomCam’s relationship with the Union
  - Attended a meeting with SUAS
  - Helped with the shadowing scheme
  - Ran Forum
  - Went to OSCCA training
- Went to University training on sexual harassment
- Met with a campaigner for Cambridge for Cycling
- Attended University Prevent training
- Had a meeting about the University’s Race Equality Charter Mark application
- Met with Adam Branch to discuss ways to diversify reading lists

CUSU LGBT+ CAMPAIGN

• Tom Ashford (LGBT+ Autonomous Campaign, President):

Next Council we will be proposing a motion for a constitution change that we have been working on.

There has been LGBT+ history month going on. We have put a range of events on and a lot of Colleges have been running their own events which we have been promoting.

The flags went up last Wednesday. There was more participation than last year – although I’m not quite sure of the numbers. We bought six flags ourselves which we have been loaning out to Colleges. It has been a useful exercise working with College reps to get this organised. We have been really bad with our communications with College reps over the past couple of years, so this has been really good for us and is something we would like to maintain.

We have been starting to make arrangements for a new club night that would start next academic year. We haven’t been affiliated with one this year – there’s been an independent one. We have been working with several promoters and we’re trying to establish something for the long-term. For the last decade there has been a different LGBT+ club night every year, and we want to do something that is actually going to last.

We are working on web resources. Our website has a lot of stuff on and is disorganised. Currently we don’t have a computing officer, I have been doing that alongside my current role.

We will be updating our documents on transgender inclusivity which we will try to send to other Colleges by the end of this term.

Sponsorship wise, we had plans to set up a £600 a year sponsorship, however we haven’t been keeping up with this. Communication has been really slow on both sides and a lot of communication was made with the previous president who recently graduated. We had a long chat on the phone and are aiming to have the £600 for this year added onto next year’s total.

We haven’t spent very much of our budget this year – we were very inactive during Michaelmas term.

We have assigned our current Welfare Officer the additional role of Library Officer. We currently have a very underused library in the CUSU basement and we want to start promoting this more.
CUSU BME CAMPAIGN

- Nadine Batchelor-Hunt, BME Campaign, President:

Been working on issues regarding racial profiling at a variety of Colleges including Kings and Clare.

The fact that Churchill JCR does not have a BME rep has been in the student press recently; I therefore sent an email to its JCR.

There has been a recent influx in anti-Semitic incidents around Cambridge for the last week or so. I have been in touch with the JSOC President.

We have been working with Eireann on access initiatives.

CUSU DISABLED STUDENTS’ CAMPAIGN

Updated by Audrey Sebatindira in section 5.

CUSU INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS’ CAMPAIGN

No representative was in attendance.

CUSU WOMEN’S CAMPAIGN

Updated by Jessica Wing in section 5.

6. QUESTIONS TO COMMITTEES, CAMPAIGN TEAMS AND THE EXECUTIVE

Amatey, in your update you said you met with Graham Virgo, is that right? If so, how did that go?

- I have an announcement to be presented in the next section.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE COUNCIL

- Roberta Huldisch prepared this statement which was read by Amatey in her absence:

‘I’m sorry I am not able to be at Council tonight due to illness. I have an update about the public display of Class Lists which I wanted to share with you. This is not confidential information so you may pass it on and report on it if you wish.

During the most recent meeting of the General Board Education Committee, the Pro Vice Chancellor Education noted the following (and I quote from the unconfirmed minutes):

"that the Regent House had by ballot rejected proposals made in the Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on the public display of class-lists. Class lists would therefore continue to be displayed outside the Senate House. He also noted, however, that in a referendum organised by CUSU in November 2016 students had requested an easy opt-out system. Moreover, it had recently become apparent that new Data Protection legislation, which would come into force in May 2018, would place greater emphasis on active consent being sought from data subjects for data collection and use, and it had been suggested that moving to an opt-in system for publication of class lists might consequently be necessary. A move to an opt-in system would be a considerable shift from the current procedures that allowed students to opt-out only in certain prescribed circumstances."

(end quote)
In short, the University has received legal advice which has indicated that the public display of Class Lists will likely become illegal under new data protection laws before the 2018 Easter term Exams. This is unless an opt-in system is instated. In this light, it might not make sense to invest in an easier opt out which would not be set up until next year and would very likely be obsolete by then. Nonetheless I expressed CUSU’s support for an opt-out system, at the very least until the legal assessments are final. I also asked for the Committee to review the system for this year in order to make sure opting out is as straightforward as possible within the University's financial and constitutional bounds. This may result in a guidance document urging Tutors to support applications for withdrawal from the class list with minimal supporting evidence.

Finally I will quote again from the committee minutes to outline the next steps:

"It was agreed that:

1) the Officers should prepare a paper for discussion at the next meeting considering arguments for, and the implications of, an easier opt-out system and for an opt-in system; and

2) for the 2017 examinations, the Applications Committee guidance for opt-out should be reviewed to ensure that the current system was as simple as possible for students to use." (end quote)

Please direct questions about this to me (Roberta) at education@cusu.cam.ac.uk where I will be happy to respond. Have a great CUSU Council.

• Do you have a statement on how you feel about this?
  - I got this around half an hour ago. In term of CUSU’s position, not much has changed in as much as we are asking for an opt-out system this year. I think what the University is going to do is produce an opt-in opt-out system, semantically there may not be much difference. EU data protection law says that students have to give their express consent in order for that information to be publically displayed. The EU legislation doesn’t actually effect the publication of the class lists, it affects how that information is collected and whether the consent of the individual has been received.

• Is there a chance that the University will just leave this as is as we’re planning to leave the EU anyway?
  - As far as I’m aware, the government is proposing with Brexit to leave but transfer all current EU laws with one Great Repeal Bill. By May 2018, this new legislation will still most likely be in force.

• What will happen with the exams this year in 2017?
  - There will be a paper presented at the next committee looking at all the options on how to implement the opt-out by Easter term examinations 2017. The process won’t be the final one that is used because they will have to look at this new legislation. Whilst it seems that they initially thought they could just leave the system as is, they are going to present all the various options available. The minimal option available is to try and get guidance to Senior Tutors to allow applications to that committee go through with minimal evidence.

• What do you mean by minimal evidence?
  - I don’t know what this guidance will be, but this will not be medical evidence. I don’t think the statutes and ordinances specifically outline that medical evidence is required. I would
say that the University is reluctant at this stage to involve Regent House again in this discussion. Anything that they can do within the current constitutional framework, they will try and do.

8. DISCUSSIONS

- Proposed changes to CUSU’s Standing Orders (20 minutes)

The following should be read alongside the presentation Amatey gave to Council here

- Amatey: The point of this presentation is to give you an overview of some of the things that we’re changing in the standing orders so it doesn’t come as a surprise when we ask you to vote on them.

Timeline

For this week, between now and next Tuesday, I will hopefully send out the documents in the bulletin so all students have access to them.

The Union Development team will be asking for this to go to referendum alongside the Lent elections.

The standing orders can change a lot more easily than the constitution. Even if there are things in there that you don’t 100% agree with, there is an opportunity later on this year to have a conversation about fine tuning certain things.

Trustee’s responsibilities

Trustees are there because CUSU is a charity, and charity law requires us to have them.

We have decided – because the trustee’s powers had been outlined more clearly in the constitution – in the standing orders to outline some more reporting responsibilities to Council.

What we are proposing is that there is new guidance to CUSU Council via the Chair, certainly on what is allowed under CUSU’s aims.

- Will it be the case if somebody submits a motion that the trustees deem unacceptable, it will then be sent back for redraft with recommendations?
  - The trustees won’t get involved in this process. The Chair will be given the information needed to advise, but trustees won’t step in – if ever – until it’s gone through. In order to overturn a democratic decision they would have to have a meeting with minutes which outlined why the decision didn’t correspond with the aims of the charity.

- How different is this to the procedure which occurred with TCS?
  - TCS was a budgetary decision, that wasn’t to do with a motion passing through which had to be blocked. There were no changes in the budget with the TCS change, TCS is getting exactly the same amount of money as it did before.

- Is this maintaining the relatively wide provisions in the constitution that they can do it if they believe it is in the best interests of CUSU?
- Yes. Prior to these changes they were allowed to do that, but there was no guidance on what would happen if they did do that.

- I presume the balance is that we can remove them relatively easily?
  - Yes. You can’t necessarily change the decision, but you can get rid of them.

**CUSU Council + Faculty Reps**

- In my faculty there is both a graduate and an undergraduate representative. Who is currently allowed to come to Council?
  - What is supposed to happen now is that a faculty forum decides which of these two representatives will come to Council. This faculty forum exists in our governing documents but hasn’t met in a long time. This is why we are introducing reforms.

- I take it that whoever is Chair of CUSU Council, if they possess a Common Room vote, they would have to find someone to proxy as them?
  - Yes

- These changes seem like a constitutional matter, not a matter for the standing orders.
  - Some of these positions could be amended e.g. sabbatical officers. There is potential for things to change.
  - *Mark McCormack, CUSU General Manager:* CUSU Council provisions were indeed in the Constitution. We made a request to move it out in line with the strategy of flexibility in the future. It is extremely irregular for students unions to have student council provisions in their constitutions. We had to ask our lawyers to put in what is in there at the moment.

- Do you think it is sensible for Sabbatical Officers to be able to vote, given a vote could go against them? Do you think it is sensible for them to express their views in this way?
  - They can currently campaign in referendums or present a motion, and this could get voted down. To some extent this system is a bit more accountable in the sense that you can see their views being expressed alongside everyone else.

- How do you select the 6 School Level Academic Representatives? Some schools have an undergraduate and a graduate representative. Would you pick one of them?
  - Yes. We will look into that. We could bump that number into 12 but I will look into that.

- With the Sabbs who are heads of autonomous campaigns, will they not get two votes? If they get one, which of these two potential votes will they represent?
  - They will get one. I will consult the two Sabbatical Officers who this affects, partly because they have to vote in line with their campaign anyway and they are not mandatable by Council. This would always be the same as they could not vote out of line with their campaign.

- Colleges with for example, an affiliated JCR and a disaffiliated MCR, do they just continue not sending the MCR representative?
  - Yes
• Is there any potential business of CUSU Council that mean the Sabbs shouldn’t have a vote because CUSU Council’s responsibility is to hold them accountable?
  - We will look into best practice on this. It may be that members of the Executive are bound by a conflicts of interest policy.
  - *Mark McCormack:* The University team have drafted at the moment into the Council provisions that Sabbs can’t vote on things like their own salary. There is a general conflict of interest clause that applies to all reps which says that if they have a personal benefit from the motion etc. they can’t vote. However that doesn’t extend to the budget unless for example, the salary set for a Sabb is passed in motion with the budget and not before, in which case it would apply.

• Right now CUSU Council is quite big and not that many people turn up. In this context the proposed quorum of 30 members is a bit odd. Wouldn’t it be better to reduce the overall number of proposed representatives per College?
  - We didn’t feel it was right at this point to introduce a conversation about cutting down the number of representatives. This is because the tradition of having the President and the Vice President involved and engaged is, I think, a good thing. Having a low quorum in that respect is in recognition that we need something that works. Quite often each Common Room will send one representative, unless it is something controversial where everyone turns up.

• Could the quorum of 30 members be too high?

  If all the Colleges disaffiliated CUSU would be screwed because Council couldn’t make a quorum in this instance.

• Giving colleges with large and small student bodies the same voting power raises representation issues.
  - We spoke about this. On University committees the number of students at your college only matters when you are paying for services centrally. In terms of the amount of representation you have, this doesn’t change. Normally it’s one person on Bursar’s and Senior Tutor’s committee for example. Once you start getting into proportional and representation in terms of Colleges, you end up in ridiculous situations where Peterhouse could have 1 rep and Homerton 7. We decided to keep it simple.

• What happens if you have a case where more Colleges than actual students support a motion, but because of the electoral system this motion passes?
  - This is inevitable as we have to have a system that works. I would encourage people to come back to Council and revisit motions. If Council members don’t think that they should be making decisions, they can take it to general meetings or a referendum.

• With the quorum, are you deciding it should be members rather than votes?
  - It should be 30 votes.

• Amatey: We can’t really enforce very much, because we don’t have the resources to do so and it’s not in our culture, but does anyone have any ideas as to how we can ensure that the proxy system is accountable?
  - Ensure that the proxy is at the same college as the student.
- Also ensure that the person is from the same School, if a School Level Academic Representative.
- Either the Chair or Secretary of the Council should be informed beforehand, with a time deadline. They should give a statement on how the proxy should act.
  - Rachel Mander, CUSU Chair: I do currently get emails occasionally, not all the time, but I don’t always check or probe.
- Alex Cicale, CUSU Democratic Support Co-ordinator: In the minutes it always states if someone has voted as proxy for a member and who this person is.
- If there is going to be a proxy, it shouldn’t be someone who is proposing one of the motions.
- I think you should proxy for an individual, not their position(s). So if a person holds two votes because of two different roles, they should not be allowed to proxy one of those votes to someone else when they themselves would only have been allowed to exercise one vote.
  - Amatey: There needs to be clear guidance on what to do if you have been elected twice. There could possibly be a standing proxy if it was the same person each time.

**Why does voting have to be in person? What is the objection to an online system with a deadline which could allow people to vote for something remotely?**
- The main reason for that is that motions change. Amendments are therefore brought in and the final motion may look very different to the original motion. However you do raise an interesting question about amendments, and whether we believe these could be submitted in advance and potentially given to the person proposing before Council who can decide whether to accept them as friendly or not.
  - I think that could speed Council up a bit.
- You should still allow amendments on the day as well as in advance.

**Motions**

**It depends on how complicated the two resolutions are. If you get two very different results and people try to amend one motion so it basically resembles the other one, things might get a little messy.**

We would like to propose that the Chair be given a bit more discretion in how motions are presented. That information will be communicated to individuals before Council e.g. if an individual has an access requirement which means they are unable to stand up and give a 5 minute speech, the Chair could put provisions in place.

**Executive**

Current practice doesn’t really exist as a thing. The constitution says that there is an Executive which is supposed to meet and discuss several things. This doesn’t actually meet, partly because the position of CUSU Co-ordinator doesn’t exist anymore.

We are proposing that we reinstate the Executive. Because the Board of Policy Scrutiny failed, I have decided that the best way for policy to be accountable is for the Executive to meet.
The reason it doesn’t exist is because the person in the University who is supposed to get the information about who the Faculty Reps are, can’t get them from all the faculty administrators in all of the different departments. There is a lack of communication as well as lack of consistency and timing of the various elections.

- The Graduate Union has a mailing list of all the Graduate Faculty Reps
  - It’s not yet complete. It doesn’t have everyone on because the University doesn’t know who all of these people are.

- I represent the Law Faculty and it doesn’t really align with the rest of the School. I worry that this new system will mean some of the more niche faculties won’t have as much of a voice amidst broader school.
  - I will look into this and potentially discuss with you and other Faculty Reps.