**CUSU Council: Lent III**

**Monday 18th February 2019**

1. **Objections to the order of items on the agenda**

None

1. **Matters arising from the minutes of the last Council meeting**

None

1. **Announcements by Committees, Campaign Teams and the Executive**

**Shadab:** open forum on 27th with the admin office. It is an opportunity to ask questions on things they may be less forthcoming with. If you would like to submit questions in advance, send them in by this Friday.

**Claire (and WomCam):** Consultation on disciplinary procedure is on CUSU website and WomCam page. Need to push through changes to make it in our favour so send emails to Oscar or Claire. These can be just supporting the changes and can be submitted on behalf of yourself or a common room etc. Just under a week left.

**Emrys:** Remind DSO’s to connect on Facebook page and ensure they have notifications turned on to make sure they see circulation. Elections committee are meeting tomorrow and 25th with events on how to win votes and influence students as well as an opportunity to ask questions about rules/ campaigning and possibly some snacks.

**Matt:** less than 5 hours left to vote on student led teaching awards. Please share a final reminder.

**Ethical Affairs:** Voting on the living wage campaign, feel free to get involved. Also focussing on college divestment. If you would like to set up a movement in your college get in touch.

**BME:** Minutes from meetings have been uploaded. Keep a look out for prevent.

**iCUSU:** Intercollege survey on disparity in colleges and motions submitted.

**LGBT+:** Elections and nominations close midnight Friday.

1. **Discussions**

None

1. **Ordinary policy motions from Previous Council**

Motion to support the provision of menstrual products-

Approved to be adopted into policy.

1. **Proposed Ordinary Policy Motions**
	1. **Motion to resolve international applicant access difficulty**

Presented by iCUSU:

In the past few months interviewed colleges and international applicants. Found that applicants struggle with applications and the cost of expensive interviews. Aim to promote more video interviewing and an interview centre in Africa, where there currently are none.

Questions:

Q: I am an international student and I found that they don’t send people to interview for a specific subject area. You could be interviewed by someone from Chemistry whilst applying for politics.

A: Personally had to fly from Australia to the UK for interview so mostly pushing for video interviews as they are not offered everywhere or in most STEM colleges, due to the interview process. Would suggest interview centres to provide indications for admission staff ahead of interviews.

Amendments:

None

Speeches in favour/ against:

Speech in favour: The travelling for interviews also disproportionately affects disabled students travelling to Cambridge, even from in the UK, so the use of video interviews would benefit these as well.

Summary:

This is a good point and the primary point of the motion is definitely to set up interviews via video.

Vote:

All in favour. **Motion passes.**

* 1. **Motion to resolve inter-college discrepancy in international student vacation storage and accommodation provision.**

Presented by iCUSU:

This motion was also based on the survey conducted. Found the current provision of holiday accommodation and storage was very varied as well as the scholarship information. You don’t know what is available until you are at the colleges so need more clarity in advance as well as the scholarship information through the website being more efficient and updated.

Questions and comments:

C: The University has already agreed to centralise data and what they’re offering. Cambridge trust is responsible for the scholarships and are separate so should amend this part.

C: the postgraduate (PG) colleges have already done this and it is important for the undergraduate colleges to do this as well. The model already exists. Believe holiday accommodation already exists.

Q: has been under the impression that the colleges don’t have spare rooms over the breaks, is this not the case? (regarding point 3)

A: You can apply for colleges to give accommodation. If not, you have to either go home or rent elsewhere. The right to access room is not available across all colleges. Alternative accommodation is approximately £50/ night as opposed to £19-25/ night from the university.

Amendments:

‘CUSU resolves: To lobby the Cambridge student’s admission office to provide a centralised point of reference for all scholarship opportunities at postgraduate and undergraduate level.’

‘CUSU resolves: to lobby the university to facilitate the sharing of information between colleges so international students can find and identify alternative accommodation’

Vote:

All in favour, **motion passes**.

1. **Proposed standing order changes**

Presented by Evie: Summary of the balanced motion

This is a balanced motion with multiple strands, all of which is up for discussion. Some points are mentioned in both proposal A and B. They are based on lots of consultation from November to January and then council discussions. There was an overwhelming feeling that there wasn’t representation by NSS delegates and that they shouldn’t vote on council. There should also be equal MCR and JCR representation, especially with an increasing number of each group attending university. The union development team will be replaced by a democracy steering group- there will be chair, elections chair and president chair to ensure that the policy is enacted, and council runs smoothly. Ethical affairs to be made a campaign and the opportunity for more campaigns in the future. Part time executive vote to be moved to take place alongside the sabbatical officer elections.

The two proposals have been created on the consensus is that council should be less about politics and more about academic and college issues and these are the two most feasible options.

**A:** devolved council with 1 rep per common room, removing the NUS delegates. Devolve into college and academic forums. They can make statements as a body and put forward motions to council alongside any motions from individuals.

**B:** two representatives per common room.

Questions:

Q: is the idea that we vote between the two motions and then vote on whether it is approved?

A: there are first questions on both and then vote in favour of one or another. The majority vote makes this the proposal and then can ask questions about this and put forward amendments then vote on motion.

Q: would liberation campaigns be entitled to attend both?

A: People could ask to come, but would not be the voting members e.g. the JCR etc.

Q: Would the part time executives start straight away?

A: they would start in line with the sabbatical officers in July but could work together before then.

Q: school reps don’t tend to participate in CUSU, are there any plans to get them involved?

A: the system last changes about 2 years where there was a move to school reps in order to be more streamlined. The attendance of school reps to council never really came into place. Alongside the academic forum and review there will be a new and better system for them to more easily contact students.

Q: Would prescon remain the same or would it go down to one attending?

A: it will remain very casual and numbers not changed.

Q: how will motions work? How will it be decided for a motion to be put forward?

A: Could collectively decide to put a motion together after a discussion point

Q: Who would the academic forum include? All academic reps? School faculty or other academic reps?

A: would also include department reps. It’s informal, not a legislated body so anyone would be welcome.

Speeches:

Speech in favour of A:

It is what I hoped council would be. It is very helpful to share infromatuon and ideas to help be more effective representing students. The difficulty with this is potentially less engagement at council but would mean more people involved would be engaged in the work of CUSU.

Speech against B:

Very critical of the notion of bringing back faculty reps. Peterhouse dominates faculty reps and they seem to not care what CUSU does; only interested in what happens at a faculty level and unsure that they would contribute.

Speech against A:

Proposal A risks creating another level of bureaucracy and making CUSU’s work completely opaque. Not sure it is a good way of streamlining.

Response: they would not have to go through the forum, anyone can bring anything to council at any point. The aim is to increase accessibility by removing the formal scare and allowing people to talk. Would function like a lib campaign where people come to meetings to discuss things that they care about and feel more enabled and supported to write a motion.

Q: there are no schools reps present at council, were they invited today?

A: there was no more effort today than any other day but they get emails about the events in general.

Summation: Evie

There are clear flaws at the moment with how council works, whilst the sabbs prefer A, please vote for either in order to improve it.

Vote between Proposal A and B:

Majority vote for Proposal A, 3 votes for Proposal B and 1 abstention.

**Proposal A adopted as motion**.

Questions:

Q: Robinsons have a student association and the MCR is less political and more social. Does this allow the MCR to consent for someone to nominate?

A: preferably they would nominate another graduate to act as proxy.

Q: on the point of faculty reps, not convinced that we could encourage them to attend. Is there any example of a university wide issue that could be discussed here as examples of why they should come?

A: several options (decolonisation projects, reasonable adjustments) but the obvious value is from talking and sharing resources as well as learning what others have done to be successful. Some can feel its them against the world, this structure offers support.

Q: is the academic forum open to college academic affairs reps?

A: Not officially members but they would be able to attend like in council.

Amendments:

Approved (friendly amendment): D7(i) council voting membership should be 2 per college, where there are 2 common rooms, 1 should be held by the JCR and where there is an MCR, they should have the second vote.

Proposed Amendment (by Ethical Affairs):

“To change CUSU believes and CUSU resolves to the following:

CUSU believes:

1. That the following will increase the effectiveness of CUSU:

1. Moving the elections of the Part-Time Executive to alongside sabbatical officer elections
2. Replacing the Union Development Team with a Democracy Steering Group

2. That in order to best represent academic and college issues it is most effective to devolve council and create two bodies designed specifically to address these issues.

3. The role of Ethical Affairs in CUSU structures is currently unclear and could be improved. The clear long term goal for CUSU should be to make Ethical Affairs a sabbatical officer.

4. That in the short-term it may improve the effectiveness of CUSU to create ‘CUSU Campaigns’ which would include the CUSU Liberation campaigns and Ethical Affairs and which would allow for the creation of more campaigns in the future. However, there are significant concerns surrounding this proposal and thus these changes should be a trial run which will be continually evaluated, leading to a review in time for the Lent 2020 CUSU elections.

CUSU resolves:

1. To adopt the standing order changes in Appendix A/B
2. To continually evaluate the effectiveness of the standing order changes to Ethical Affairs, leading to a substantive review before the Lent 2020 CUSU elections
3. To work towards looking into making Ethical Affairs a sabbatical officer role, subject to further consultation and votes by CUSU Council”

Reasoning: we accept ethical affairs structure isn’t working and the ambiguity of its position between sabbatical officers and campaign is part of this. Problems have been in the failure to work well with sabbatical officers. Better coordination and a bigger say should be adopted. Other universities have a campaign officer, and this would not be an imminent thing but should make it clear tat this will be reviewed. Ethical Affairs have developed a lot and will continue to do so. Suggesting a review in a years’ time before the 2020 elections to decide.

Questions:

Q: can we do this procedurally?

A: standing orders are permanent but this is just a ‘we review’ so can be voted to revoke.

Q: is there a designated separation between ethical affairs and CUSU?

A: technically they are like part time executive officers and overlap with liberation campaigns.

Q: is there anything which says what the ethical affairs role is?

A: yes, it is in the standing orders.

Speech against:

Personal beliefs are inline with the Ethical Affairs. Whilst other campaigns relate to individual students, this is more fluid and lots of work comes before council. By becoming like other campaigns and creating the opportunity for further campaigns risks making it a more political body.

Response: campaign doesn’t change this, it is intended to be a campaign in the proposal.

Speech in favour:

Making the role a sabbatical officer would be a more effective way to make it representative. People are more likely to vote if it’s for a sabb.

Q: is that the priority? Where would it end e.g. could there be a BME sabb?

A: looking into it rather than making it a priority, just an option.

Closing speech:

We don’t want to make it a sabbatical role but feel it should be consulted on and see in a year whether it removes from the sabbatical officers or would enable them to do more work. Being pseudo sabbs is not sustainable and structure would be helpful. This is just a commitment to review it not a decision to make a sabbatical officer.

Vote:

Majority in favour, with 5 against and 9 abstentions.

**Amendment is accepted as part of Proposal A.**

Amendment: CUSU resolves to open more formal communication with the NUS delegates and student body.

Amendment (denied): remove the votes of sabbatical officers and liberation campaigns so decisions voted on by reps.

* Chair denied as felt it was too large an amendment to be made and could be brought to the next council if submitted in advance in order to allow people to consult.

Vote on Standing Order Change (Proposal A):

As this is a standing order change, it requires a 2/3 majority to pass.

Majority in favour, 5 against and 1 abstained. **Motion accepted.**

1. **Any other business**

Next prescon is to be held next Tuesday. Everyone comes to council as normal as changes haven’t been implemented yet.