# CUSU Council- Lent 1

# Monday 21st January 2019

1. Objections to the order of items on the agenda

None

1. Corrections to the minutes of the last council meeting

Not seen so pending approval on next council meeting

1. Matters arising from the minutes of the last council meeting

None

1. date, time and venue of upcoming council meeting

4th February 2019, 7 pm in Room 1, Mill Lane Lecture theatres

1. Announcements by committees, campaign teams, and the executive

Evie, CUSU President:

Update from trustee board- the chief executive resigned and we are currently in an interim period as the new chief exec will be starting part time in February and then full time from march. In the meantime, Matt and Evie are taking over. The mid-year budget review won’t formally happen.

Video updates for council are now happening, so sabb updates will happen through those and the accountability forms. only announcements in meetings now.

Lent elections are coming up so contact the sabbs if you’re interested in running.

Matt:

Academic reps training is tomorrow night. Student Led teaching awards nominations are still open, nominate people!

Emrys:

DSO training on 28th January, 2:30- 5 PM in the CUSU lounge, will post link.

Claire:

WomCam forum held every Thursday for women and non-binary people.

Christine:

Alternative families events coming up, Our Streets exhibition end of term.

Shadab:

Shadowing scheme starting, signup to be a non-mentor volunteer

BME Campaign:

Term card is up on facebook. JCR/MCR BME officers met today to discuss how to work together, minutes will be up on facebook.

CUSU LGBT+:

51 events coming up this term, lots for the LGBT+ history month

DSC:

Term card up on facebook page

WomCam:

Claire is finalising a guide to the women’s campaign- message her for any questions you would like answered in it.

Ethical Affairs:

First ever green week started yesterday, events everyday for the rest of the week and green officers are putting some on as well; petitions online on ethical affairs facebook page to sign. big meeting in two weeks for Living Wage campaign, contact us if you want your college involved.

1. Questions to committees, campaign teams, and the executive

Murray edwards JCR: Student support initiative- what’s happening? What can we hear from sabbs about what they’re advocating for?

Evie: running an open meeting on the SSI on Thursday with Graham Virgo, student press will cover; overall, 500million budget and now is the chance to feed into where exactly that money goes to support students best – this could go to next Council as a discussion.

1. Announcements by the council

Boycott the nss! Lots more info on the cusu website as well as more material coming soon, including flyers in the post.

Question (Selwyn JCR): have the uni promised free coffee for filling out the NSS?

Answer: Graham Virgo who sent the email actually had no idea that was happening… In any case, CUSU will be running events which will probably include free beverages!

Question (Queens JCR): is the uni obliged to ask students to fill out the NSS?

Answer: yes, pretty much, though they don’t need to be enthusiastic

Question (Medwards MCR): the coffee thing is fundamentally against how to run a good survey from my experience in the business school – can you make them stop?

Answer: agree – we’re not sure what’s happening but there are many other reasons to boycott too, disadvantages female and BME academics etc

Question (Kings MCR): how do we coordinate initiatives with CUSU and other Common Rooms?

Answer: can bring motions here; bring to PresCon; use the CUSU Connects Facebook groups; use Liberation Campaigns meetings if relevant

1. discussions

None

1. ordinary policy motions from previous councils
2. Motion to edit c(9) in the dsc consitution approved
3. proposed ordinary action motions
4. Motion to support st edmund’s college cr on the matter of the toby jackman newton trust jrf

For: St Edmund’s CR

- In October 2018, JRF given to Dr Noah Carl – 1000 applicants, one of the most competitive

- He attended three conferences in London linked to eugenics – UCL has launched investigations into the fact that these happened

- Noah Carl has defended these conferences in a public paper

- Has published papers in a discredited forum

- Students asked college for more transparency regarding Noah Carl’s appointment – they did not take this very seriously and had the Master appoint himself as judge and jury of the appointment, when he presided over it in the first place

- Independent letter signed by 200+ academics went to the Master calling for investigation, CC’d to University VC – this made the college take notice and they said they would have internal and external investigations

- College has now formed an internal investigation panel to look into whether Noah Carl’s work is racist; comprised of three senior fellows of the college, treating as a human resource matter

- Student body in a CR open meeting has unanimously voted to reject this investigation panel, don’t believe it can be independent because of who they have chosen to be on it – there is also no BME representation on the panel – there is no timeline put forward in which the investigation should be finished – there are no social scientists on the panel

- Students are not being taken seriously by St Edmund’s college; have decided to protest, are asking for support from CUSU Council

Question (Selwyn JCR): Point 1 CUSU Resolves – what sort of thing can CUSU be doing?

Answer: St Edmund’s student body want student representation on the panel and external expert representation on the panel; CUSU can help put pressure there. Want loud voices from other colleges supporting that academic research has an ethical responsibility.

Question (Murray Edwards MCR): Anything practical that other colleges can do? Would be heartbroken if this were my college.

Answer: Thinking about more direct forms of protest; would be helpful to get numbers in for these, e.g. sit-ins, banner roll-out; will also be organising a series of talks on race and science so help with publicising these would be great.

Summary: We need no reminder of the historical repercussions of work like Noah Carl’s in terms of eugenics; pseudoscience should not be accepted; academics have an ethical responsibility.

Vote: motion passes

contact st Edmund’s cr with any campaigning ideas.

1. Fair Pay and equal pay for staff: motion to support upcoming industrial action

For:

- This is a strike that really affects students; fair pay across the board, equal pay for women; all affects PhD students the most, who are our members, so we should be supporting them

- Issues directly relevant for students – things that are hard for CUSU to change relating to the way staff are treated – supervision quality, assessment and feedback quality, high turnover of staff, departments full of white men – these are all related to how much staff are paid, how much time they have, which staff are promoted and get better pay

- The only way we can make progress on these core issues is by supporting staff locally and nationally

- As CUSU if we pass this motion we will:

* Give information, inform students about exactly what’s going on at both a practical and a wider reasoning level
* Support students in all ways that don’t impact the strike, e.g. library times, alternative study spaces
* Public statement supporting UCU and striking staff

Amendment (Fitzwilliam JCR): Concerned by CUSU Resolves 7.1, ‘mitigating the negative impact of disruption on CUSU members’ – JCR concerned that this was so far down on the list, can it be a higher priority?

Answer: lower down because written in chronological order – but happy to amend and move point 7 to be point 1

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT ACCEPTED

Amendment (Homerton JCR): In 7.1 and 7.2 – last year we had reports of students being abused for crossing picket lines – hoping there would be a mention of this in 7.1, some sort of condemnation of abuse

Answer: we should underline this isn’t round 2 of last year’s strikes, different people and different issue; UCU investigated every issue that arose last year, speak to Matt after if any issues that people feel weren’t investigated; leave this out for now but speak about it afterwards and how we can properly put this into place

Question (Medwards MCR): Strikes last year very stressful for many students, especially grad students sitting on both sides of the line; can Matt bring documents to Council on what processes CUSU goes through to support students?

Answer: yes, this would be covered by ‘educate and inform’ – want students to know we have their backs and are lobbying on their behalf to the Uni – we can report back on our strike strategy next CUSU Council

Question (Trinity JCR): How likely is the strike to actually happen?

Answer: Ballot closes end of Feb, strikes can’t happen until after March 12th, thinking 70/30 likelihood at a guess

Amendment (Churchill JCR): Lots of students support the cause that this is all about, but quite a few are more uncertain about supporting strike action – can we split the motion into two motions?

Answer: we would be disseminating information anyway so having that as its own thing separate from supporting the strike doesn’t really make sense

Chair: this is too large an amendment to raise now

Question (Jesus JCR): echo splitting it into two since they haven’t voted for strikes yet – one of the main things that came out of our JCR survey was support for the cause but difficulty with the impact on student welfare – feel we should split into two and vote on the first part now and the strike support part later

Answer (Matt): if people had amendments this large they should have been submitted in advance – balloting has opened so now is the crucial time rather than waiting until it’s too late, staff need to know students are behind them (or not) when they vote

Chair: amendment too large for now. Any objections to this?

Amendment (Churchill JCR): remove Resolves 1

Matt: Not accepted as a friendly amendment; we could take the motion in parts instead. Strongly against deferring the motion – Council needs to take a position.

PROCEDURAL MOTION (Churchill JCR): Propose splitting the motion.

Vote: Procedural motion fails

Against the motion (Magdalene JCR): As a representative of students I can’t wholeheartedly support something that will impact negatively on my students’ education. We support in theory but the negative impact on education means I can’t support. Students preparing for important exams face cancelled lectures/seminars/revision sessions, stress. At the end of the day we’re here to get a degree; can’t support a compromised education. Appreciate staff are being treated unfairly but cannot justify strike action.

For the motion (Peterhouse JCR): On the point that this will damage students’ education, as already said, the poor conditions staff work under is the biggest negative impact on students’ education and strike action will work to improve that. Draw attention to Notes (9); would damage the standing of this Council and CUSU to alienate UCU re: the memorandum of understanding between CUSU/UCU/GU.

Against the motion (Newnham MCR): CUSU exists to protect students, not staff, though understand there is an overlap. Concerned strikes will disrupt lectures/exams/graduation; as a student representative I can’t support this in good faith.

Summary: This isn’t an easy decision; the staff that make that decision to sacrifice pay and go on strike aren’t making an easy decision; we want to support something with a short term disruption for some students because we want to make the decision that the long term benefits, on principle but also out of self-interest in terms of what’s harmful overall for students in our membership, mean that we need to support the strike. Uni has given staff a 17% pay cut over the last decade while borrowing 4mill and becoming the biggest property developer in the south of England. 19% gender pay gap. Uni still willing to hire eugenicist academics in colleges. These are much more serious detriments to our education than what will be a difficult period short term.

Vote: motion passes

Matt: grateful we’ve had this debate now – being on one side absolutely doesn’t mean I’m not taking concerns incredibly seriously – get in contact, we’ll be planning how we can mitigate these over the next few weeks.

1. Motion to fund a portion of CUSU ethical affairs’ University green week

For:

- Green Week, over 1k interested in events on FB, broadening the work Ethical Affairs and Green Officers are doing, promoting the work of a whole variety of groups and societies in Cambridge.

- 3 panel discussions; we need to fund the travel costs for the speakers for these.

- Ethical Affairs and Green Officers’ budgets don’t cover all of this – asking for £375 from the Council Free Budget to help out.

Amendment (Trinity JCR): change the wording of CUSU Notes to clarify/cite the 2018 IPCC report more clearly.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT ACCEPTED.

Question (Magdalene JCR): Can we encourage speakers to travel by green methods?

Answer: most of them are coming by train.

[Clarification on what the Council Free Budget is – a pot of money that is democratically decided by Council what it is allocated to.]

Question (Murray Edwards MCR): every time CFB is requested is to back up existing budgets, i.e. it’s from sabbs and campaigns rather than external members?

Answer: Council will get a chance to look over the CUSU budget and think about these issues – but also we will be doing more to promote external members applying for CFB.

[Note from Shadab: If people could plan ahead as much as possible rather than asking for CFB in order to backpay, so that we can plan ahead, that would be helpful.]

Question (King’s MCR): King’s was informed by the head porter that 7 events are happening in King’s and we didn’t know these were happening, and the porters weren’t very happy about the influx of people – could colleges be better informed in future?

Answer: Ethical Affairs were in contact with every Green Officer from every college so we hoped everyone would be aware; in future we’ll contact Presidents too.

Summary: Green Officers do great things; Green Week brings these together and gives them a targeted collective focus; 800 people are interested in tomorrow’s panel, there’s a demand for these events among the student body.

Vote: motion passes

1. proposed ordinary policy motions
2. Motion to change the standing orders for elections

For:

- Lent Elections coming up; this motion is a housekeeping of the Standing Orders. The things we’re removing from the SOs are NOT things we’re taking out as rules; we’re just taking them out of the SOs and putting them into the Elections Rules, which will be submitted to Council.

- We want to be able to have agency over what exactly the things we’re taking out of the SOs constitute and define them better, which is why we’re taking them out of the SOs and putting them into the ERs.

Question (Fitzwilliam JCR): JCR were confused about what this motion meant – can we add something to make it clearer that CUSU isn’t trying to change these rules, but just to move them from the SOs to the ERs?

Question (Robinson JCR): CUSU Believes 2 almost suggests you’re trying to change the SOs?

Amendment: remove Believes 2

Friendly amendment accepted

Question: Why is this coming before the Elections Rules have been written? Can this be deferred to next Council?

Answer: Timing issue – Standing Orders rules require two Councils.

Vote: motion passes

1. Motion to support student campaigns and movements working towards the demilitarisation of the university

For:

- Resubmitted version of last Council’s motion; people thought it wasn’t clear enough, unsure about what exactly the support asked for entailed – Resolves rewritten for this to cover what was asked last time.

- Consensus in support of the spirit of the motion last time – concerns were about what exactly CUSU was being expected to do; Resolves this time round should cover this.

- Resolves 1 specifies ‘publicly’ – we want CUSU to make public statements in support of demilitarise efforts. Resolves 2 mandates CUSU representatives to ask difficult questions and push these issues whenever they have the opportunity within their rep capacities.

- We hopefully know from last time why we should support demilitarisation

Amendment (Trinity JCR): Believes 3 is very long and no full stops – amend to split the two sentences into points 3 and 4.

Friendly amendment accepted

Question (Murray Edwards MCR): It frustrates me when motions come that are a bit murky – with a trustee hat on I can’t support this?

Answer (Emrys): Council doesn’t serve as trustees, the trustee board oversees the legal side of this. It’s hard to know how exactly different CUSU reps can advance this

Answer (Matt): We also want people to feel able to bring motions to Council without feeling that they have to be legally watertight etc.

Against the motion (Magdalene JCR): I object to this motion for several reasons. Demilitarisation is a loaded term. How many students come across military/army every day? The implication is this uni has strong military links, which I disagree with. The core values of the British army are positive – we shouldn’t be against it. The British military is well established career path for many people within this uni – this motion should more clearly condemn the arms trade, not the military. We also need to look at the positive effects that defence companies have – they develop peacetime technology etc with positive impacts, not only arms. We shouldn’t be against arms and defence companies that do many good things just because we dislike some of their actions.

Response (PTE Education): Disagree that we don’t come across the military every day in this uni – we do – sciences and engineering especially, recruitment, funding, etc. Freshers fair recruitment included actual guns on parker’s piece. Public benefit – strongly dispute that military funding is something we want, we don’t want the military setting our research agenda, a bad idea for objective knowledge production. We need to seriously critically evaluate our relationship with the military industrial complex.

Against the motion (Newnham MCR): We’re pro transparency and agree there is an ethical responsibility in investment, however will be voting against this motion because it lacks specificity re: which companies in particular count as being part of the arms trade/military industrial complex. Need a distinction between companies who create arms for peacekeeping missions etc vs who supply to countries with histories of human rights violations.

Response (PTE Education): BAE Systems is specified – clear majority revenue-wise of arms over civil engineering. There needs to be space for judgement to be exercised; as is, we don’t know the Uni’s relationships in detail – hard to specify any further.

Amendment (Murray Edwards MCR): Change CUSU Resolves 1 from “global arms trade and defence industry” – take out defence industry, makes it too broad.

Not accepted as friendly

Amendment vote:

For deleting “defence industry”: In the interests of listening to some of this evening’s concerns, and of making this motion more specific and making it about something we can definitely all agree is unequivocally bad.

Against deleting “defence industry”: We care about the intellectual shaping of the courses of our university – covers arms trade companies, but also government/defence industry pressure that shapes the curriculum; want to include the specific recognition of the latter.

Amendment fails

Summary: We mostly seem in favour of the thrust of this – we don’t want our education shaped by military interests, whether governmental or corporate.

Vote: Motion passes

Updated section:

CUSU Believes:

1. That it is antithetical to the University's stated "core values" of contribution to society, freedom of thought and expression and freedom from discrimination, among others, for the University and its constituent and affiliate bodies to be involved in resource provision of any kind (financial or otherwise) which contributes to the global arms trade and to industries whose primary goal is to supply, sustain, and profit directly from war(s) worldwide.

2. That the University and its constituent and affiliate bodies urgently owe to the members of the University a greater transparency regarding links, financial and otherwise, that may exist between the University and the arms trade.

3. That it is relevant to every student to be provided with information about, and to have a say in, the University's financial and other links with the arms trade. It is therefore within CUSU's remit in terms of representing the student voice;

4. That various CU student groups are already working to "motivate progressive changes" in this area, and that CUSU in its representative role should therefore be actively supportive of such groups, campaigns, and/or movements among the student body.

1. Any other business
2. Elections for the elections committee:

William Edwards and Arinjay Butani accepted for the two open positions on the elections committee.