

MEETING OF UNION COUNCIL TO BE HELD AT 7.00 PM ON  
THURSDAY 29 APRIL 2010 IN LECTURE THEATRE 2

**AGENDA**

In order to minimise the time taken on amendments please contact the proposer before the meeting to see if they are willing to incorporate it into their resolution and send an e- version of the amendment to the Chair – [r.reynolds@uea.ac.uk](mailto:r.reynolds@uea.ac.uk) - so that the amendment can be shown on the screen immediately rather than having to be typed during the meeting.

All current Union Policy is now available online at <http://www.ueastudent.com/voice/unionpolicy>

Remember – the Union (of UEA students) may be able to reimburse you for travel or carer expenses that you incur attending this meeting. Please check out the website for more details:  
<http://www.ueastudent.com/voice/union-council/expenses>

**1023**                      Membership

To note:                      That new members have been appointed and their names placed in the Register.

To note:                      That the following members had missed two meetings in the last semester and cease to hold office unless the Union Council, at its sole discretion, shall decide otherwise:  
S Arnold, Livewire TV, H Bains, Rock Climbing, N Clinch, Conservation & Wildlife, C Collis, Assassins, S Douglas, Fell, A Elphick, Literature, S Hilton, Anarchists, E Mulligan, NAM Other YR UG, M Le Sage, NAM YR 1 UG, R Haji-Abd-Rahman, Islamic Society, F Rogers, Dev Soc, Dolly Smith, Tea Society.

To note:                      That R Goode has resigned from Union Council.

**1024**                      Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 4 March 2010

To receive:                      The minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2010.  
(attached pp 5-22)

To confirm:                      The minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

**1025**                      Matters Arising

To consider:                      Any matters arising from previous minutes that are not

covered elsewhere on the agenda.

**1026**                    Appointments to University Committees

To appoint:            A Postgraduate Taught Member of Union Council to the Taught Programmes Policy Group.

**1027**                    Executive Action Plan (EAP) Report

To receive:            Executive report on the EAP. (to be circulated separately)

To consider:          Appropriate action.

**1028**                    Executive Committee Minutes

To receive:            Minutes of the Executive Committee meetings held on 25 February, 3 March and 18 March. (attached pp 23-28)  
Note: 11 March Meeting failed to reach a quorum.

To consider:          Appropriate action.

**1029**                    NUS National Conference

To receive:            A Report from the Communications Officer on the NUS National Conference. (attached pp 29-30)

To consider:          Appropriate action.

**1030**                    Reports from Representatives

To receive:            Any reports from Representatives that sit on University Committees.

To consider:          Appropriate Action.

**1031**                    Issues to be raised by Members of Union Council

To receive:            Reports on major issues not covered elsewhere on the Agenda, that representatives wish to draw to the attention of Council, especially where those issues require support or action by the Union.

To consider:          Appropriate action.

**1032**                    Club, Society and Peer Support Group Constitutions

To note:                That a standard constitution has been received from:  
(a) UEA Azerbaijan Society whose objects shall be: “to present the history, traditions and culture of our country to

all UEA students.”

(b) The Glee Society whose objects shall be: “to provide the opportunity to participate in a show choir, incorporating a live band. All show tunes performed will be out of context of their narrative.”

(c) The Powerboat Club whose objects shall be: “ to promote and enjoy all different types of powered nautical craft.”

(d) UEA Ladies’ Society whose objects shall be: “ to promote, in both men and women – the pursuit of traditional, ladylike activities such as baking, knitting and drinking tea.”

(e) The General Emergency Medicine Society (GEMS) whose objects shall be: “ to educate, encourage and give confidence to all individuals involved in medicine emergencies for in-hospital patients and Advanced Life Support.”

(f) AHP SOC whose objects shall be: “to arrange and organise social events, CPD events, inter-professionalism and raise the profile of the AHP.”

To note: That Sports Council endorses the proposed constitution of (c). That Societies’ Council endorses the proposed constitution of (a), (b), (e) and (f). It recommends to Council that the proposed Ladies’ Society should merge with the Gentlemen’s Society and to defer approval of (d)’s constitution.

To consider: Appropriate action.

**1033** Election of Student Trustees

To elect: Up to four Student Trustees to serve as Trustees of UUEAS. C Clarke, J Lock, H Mach, O Davis, J Whelan, P Harding, S Xu, C Lee, S Wilson are standing . (See appendices for candidate details)

**1034** Publicise Union Councillors' Votes

To receive: A resolution from J Allen (Amnesty International) and (attached pp 31-32)

To consider: Appropriate action.

**1035** Ethical Banking

To receive: A resolution from William Lacey (Environment Officer) and S Waterfield (Folk Society). (attached pp 33-34)

To consider: Appropriate action.

**1036** Going Greener UEA 2010

To receive: A resolution from Andrew Taylor (People and Planet) and William Lacey (Environment Officer) (attached pp 35-39)

To consider: Appropriate action.

**1037** UUEAS Procurement Policy

To receive: A resolution from A Taylor (Publicity Officer) and William Lacey (Environment Officer) and. (attached pp 40-43)

To consider: Appropriate action.

**1038** Affiliation to the Right to Work Campaign

To receive: A resolution from L McCafferty (Non-Portfolio Officer) and L Glasheen (Capoeira Soc). (attached pp 44-45)

To consider: Appropriate action.

**1039** Time, Date and Place of the Next Meeting

To note: That the next meeting will be held at 7.00pm on Thursday, 21 October 2010 in a venue to be arranged.

That items for the agenda should be submitted to the Representation Support Worker ([anthony.moore@uea.ac.uk](mailto:anthony.moore@uea.ac.uk)) by 12 noon on Friday 15 October 2010.

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF UNION COUNCIL HELD ON  
THURSDAY 4 MARCH 2010

- Voting Members present: J Allen, S Amin-Tilly, P Andrews, C Baldock, E Biscoe, B Bradsell, E Chir, N Church, C Clarke, R Daines, A Dalligan, J Davison, S Deacon, L Dorward, P Drew, N Fenton, D Hall, M Hossack, D Keillor, W Lacey, T Lawson, H Little, B Maniatis, T Marsh, O Matthews, L McCafferty, U Onyeka, R Pepler, K Peter, S Philip, S Poursaeedi, B Powell, X Quan, H Reddish, J Robins, Natasha Ross, J Sailing, B Schulz, F Shah, Duncan Smith, Myles Smith, H Speed, O Uthman, S Alder, G Aniviye, E Ashford, P Barker, N Barnes, N Crowe, T Dolton, T Fadden, S Foster, Z Gates, P Gearing, L Glasheen, E Gooding, L Green, E Hac, R Handforth, A Hill, D Ingram, M Jopp, R Kaiser, R Kalra, O Kalu, D Kesby, J Kiffin, T Kirk, J McCrohon, N Morgan, K Okwuada, R Pepler, J Piercey, W Pillar, J Pryor, S Simeza, K Spracklin, Andrew Taylor, Matthew Taylor, A Thomlinson, I Vaicakauskaite, R Vicary, S Waterfield, S Wozniak, L Yiding, D Youmans.
- In attendance: A Pott, (General Manager) A Moore (Representation Support Worker).
- Guest Speaker: Prof T Ward.
- Chair: R Reynolds.
- Apologies for absence: M Le Sage.

Noted:	Prof Tom Ward, Pro-Vice Chancellor Academic, outlined to Union Council the present funding situation for higher education and gave his assessment of its implications.	
Noted:	Prof Ward explained the importance of the annual letter that Hefce (The Higher Education Funding Council for England) receives from the government. The letter announces what money will be given to Universities, each year, what the scale of future funding will be and what Hefce is required by the government to do with the money. He noted that beneath some eye catching headline increases, this year's letter contained significant cuts in funding. The next stage in the funding process was that Hefce then	

	<p>writes to each university informing them of their individual funding allocation. UEA did not know their allocation as this is due to be received in mid-March.</p> <p>He drew attention to the implications of three items in the instructions to Hefce from government. The increase of 0.4% in cash terms meant a reduction in real terms. The vaunted increase in research spending was in real terms more or less flat. Thirdly, there was the 14.9% reduction in capital spending. The latter was not a problem immediately but in the long term was extremely problematic. If these cuts were sustained the entire physical infrastructure would deteriorate and universities would face an unmanageable backlog of repairs.</p> <p>He drew Council's attention to two further significant changes to funding. The so called postcode premium which helped in promoting wider participation in higher education (HE) was to be cut. Enterprise engagement funds, where universities were provided with seed money to develop partnerships with business, were being increased by 11.9%. Though politically fashionable, he argued, this policy represented a naïve hope that somehow business would magically start to provide significant funding to universities.</p> <p>The above was the overall context in which UEA, which represents about 1% of all HE expenditure, will be making decisions after it receives its funding allocation later in the month. He noted that it was early in the budget cycle and that budgetary decisions would be made according to certain principles. He would characterise the budgetary position as difficult but not catastrophic. He stressed the importance of the distinction between a short term and a long term cut. UEA could weather an enormous cut with students noticing little change for one or two years. However, although it has not been spelt out, the indications are that there will be enormous and cumulative cuts over the next three years and that these will be sustained afterwards for a long period of time. He characterised the funding situation that UEA faced as even worse than the 1980s and argued that the Thatcher cuts of the 80s will be dwarfed by what is now proposed.</p> <p>He observed that well managed universities, such as UEA, had realised that the Hefce money will always be politically vulnerable and had worked toward developing other sources of funding; this work, over the last decade, meant that Hefce funding had been reduced so that it was now only 35% of UEA's turnover.</p> <p>UEA's strategy for dealing with the cuts will be based on two principles: dual commitments to maintain the student experience and the University's academic capacity (basically, the number of academic staff).</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>How successful the University is in its strategy will depend on the depth of future cuts, the scale of which cannot be predicted, especially before the imminent general election, as the opposition parties that may make up the future government, have not made firm policy commitments on higher education funding.</p> <p>Implementation of UEA's response to the cuts can be divided into two broad areas.</p> <p>Firstly, UEA will have to find what are euphemistically known as "efficiency savings" in the non-academic parts of the University. This will be very challenging. There will be huge cutbacks in building programmes. This will be fine for a few years but eventually, it will mean teaching students in inadequate buildings.</p> <p>Secondly, UEA will be trying to find other sources of income. As its core business of teaching home undergraduate students is capped or may even be reduced, the University will be looking to expand the number of both postgraduate and international students. He drew attention to the last period of large HE cuts which had led to a crumbling of infrastructure and which had paved the way for the introduction of tuition fees, as the public had been led to believe there was no alternative. He noted that there was a fear that the same process was at work now, with the present cuts and the current review on HE funding, chaired by Lord Browne. The review will publish its finding after the general election and will provide an incoming government with an incredible weapon to enforce changes. The findings of the review are not known as yet, but, given its personnel, he argued that one can be fairly confident of the drift of its findings. He noted that at yesterday's demonstration by students against the cuts, he was asked with some vigour as to UEA's position on them.</p> <p>He would have to qualify his answer to a certain extent. UEA represents 1% of HE in financial terms and is like a cork on the water in a storm. UEA will make representations to the review but what UEA's individual position is will not be of great concern to the members of the review.</p> <p>In addition, he observed that UEA is a University and not a PLC. As with the members of this audience and the wider student body, within the University as a whole there are a multitude of views on HE funding; there is no single UEA view on the matter.</p> <p>All he would be able to give as an answer would be a slogan: HE should be adequately funded. However, HE contests for funding with schools, hospitals and, sadly, a rather expensive military that also need adequate funding. Personally, he found the latter disappointing, he would</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>rather the money spent on a tank would be spent on HE. However, bluntly, even within spending on education, HE was not a priority. For instance if there were an extra £1 billion available, he would put the money into early years education as all the evidence points to this sector having the most impact. His other priorities would be primary and secondary education before HE. In order to fund all educational sectors adequately would require a political consensus and a huge rise in income tax.</p> <p>He argued that the reality is very far from the above. The thinking behind the debate on the Browne review and the cap on tuition fees question seems to be very hard line, some would characterise it as neo-liberal, and committed to the marketisation of HE. The advocates of this policy look to the USA and what they fondly see as a private sector solution to HE funding. However, what they fail to take note of is that US government spending on HE, in a much wealthier country, is higher as a % than ours. If UK politicians argue in favour of US style funding, they should embrace the whole concept including increased government spending on HE</p> <p>He urged UEA students who wanted to understand the thinking behind the Browne review to examine the work of Nicholas Barr, an economist at LSE. Barr's work has greatly influenced policy makers on HE funding and it was important for student activists to understand and engage with his arguments if they wanted to influence the debate. See: <a href="http://econ.lse.ac.uk/staff/nb/index_own.html#pub">http://econ.lse.ac.uk/staff/nb/index_own.html#pub</a></p> <p>Once students had formed cogent evidenced based conclusions, it was important that they submit their arguments to the Browne review, they will not be ignored. However, it had to be born in mind, that any submissions would be heard in a climate where there was no political consensus on increased spending on HE.</p>	
Noted:	Prof Ward indicated that he would be happy to take questions from the audience.	
Noted:	R Archer (with the permission of Council) noted that some universities were addressing the cuts in capital spending with cuts in building maintenance and laying off large numbers of staff. She was concerned about the situation at UEA and the possibility that UEA maintenance staff would lose their jobs.	
Noted:	Prof Ward noted that there were some large egos in HE which had been manifested in some fairly ludicrous buildings. Even before the credit crunch and recession, that nobody could have predicted, these were looking like	

	poor investments.	
Noted:	R Archer interjected: "Marx predicted it".	
Noted:	<p>Prof Ward agreed but observed that the problem with Marx was that he was not very specific on the timing. He continued that there are some universities in a dire cash position with huge vast glass office buildings housing offices where the workers were losing their jobs. However, UEA, in contrast is a very well managed institution. On the capital side, money has been spent not on offices but on academic buildings and student accommodation. These have been paid for not, thankfully, by PFI but by a mix of savings and careful borrowing. A pragmatic approach has meant that UEA's financial health is reasonably robust and the University will not be in the situation of some universities where academic departments are closed as new buildings are finished.</p> <p>On job cuts, he warned that if the funding cuts are severe and long lasting, then HE job cuts will be unavoidable. How long and how severe the cuts will have to be before they impact on jobs at a well run university like UEA, he could not answer.</p> <p>However, he could assure the questioner that there was a difference between long term maintenance and capital projects. He could not make a guarantee about jobs at UEA, but the major impact will be felt outside the University. Every day maintenance has to be done, the cuts will be to capital projects which will mainly impact on major construction firms and the wider regional economy. outside of UEA.</p>	
Noted:	O Kalu (Nigerian Students' Association) noted that the cuts will have an effect on international students and wondered how they could make their voice heard.	
Noted:	<p>Prof Ward emphasised that international students were stakeholders in HE. He assured the questioner that the bad old days when, after Margaret Thatcher had lifted the cap on tuition fees for international students and universities treated international students as a cash cow, will not be replicated.</p> <p>The reason they will not return is not the altruism of university administrators but the increasingly competitive globalised marketplace for HE, where universities compete on price, facilities and student experience.</p> <p>As stakeholders, international students' input into the debate was important; they, too would be affected by the Hefce cuts.</p>	

Noted:	J Kiffin (Societies Officer) appreciated the idea that individual students should lobby the Browne review but argued that UEA as a respected research institute and as part of a powerful lobby (the 94 Group) was surely better placed to make its view heard than individual students.	
Noted:	Prof Ward noted that the questioner had referred to the “view” of UEA; the problem was there was no such thing. There was a disparate range of opinions, some of which could be described as very right wing. If he proposed to Senate that, “UEA thinks the cap should be such and such”, there would be absolute mayhem. He suggested that if this was tried tonight in this room, he would be very impressed if one could get a single coherent statement on HE funding.	
Noted:	R Archer responded from the floor that this was not the case, UUEAS had a clear policy on free education.	
Noted:	Chair noted that the policy had been carried in Council with only one vote against.	
Noted:	Prof Ward agreed that was a strong aggregated view which should indeed be put to the Browne review. However he warned Council that the review will be listening to a differing view from a highly influential lobbyist: that of Wes Streeting. He observed that Mr Streeting, as Council knows, speaks for all students. This was the nature of the political game. To conclude, he argued that it would not be trivial if UEA spoke with one voice, it was just inconceivable.	
Noted:	L McCafferty (Socialist) asked whether Prof Ward would take part in a public debate facilitated by the Students’ Union with the UCU, who are opposed to any cuts in HE funding.	
Noted:	Prof Ward was happy to have a discussion but warned that it could be similar to a debate about having better weather. There was no political consensus over higher HE spending; there was no outraged mob howling about Hefce’s decisions, shouting prioritise the universities rather than the NHS. He argued that one could debate with colleagues and advocate higher funding but that would have little basis in reality. He suggested the UCU should be talking to 20 million voters not one PVC.	
Noted:	S Poursaeedi (Futsal) asked how helpful the NUS had been to UEA’s lobbying and what more could it have done.	

Noted:	Prof Ward explained that this was a difficult question to answer, as the NUS have their own quite complex position which involves, in effect, a graduate tax. The responses by universities to the NUS proposals vary a great deal as to whether the university responding is from the Russell, 94 or other groups.	
Noted:	M Jopp (Finance Officer) noted that the UUEAS Executive meet to lobby MPs and local politicians regularly; he wondered what lobbying the University does and how successful it has been.	
Noted:	<p>Prof Ward noted that the Vice Chancellor routinely meets with MPs. UEA makes its voice heard throughout the sector. The case is made that the proposed cuts are the wrong thing to do when the economy is entering a recession as it is universities that drive the local economy and ultimately the national economy.</p> <p>UEA makes its case through the 94 Group which does have some influence with policy makers.</p> <p>However the problem is, as the minister, Lord Mandelson put it recently: "there is no money." The UK government is fighting expensive wars, has bailed out the banks, is taking in hugely reduced tax revenues.</p> <p>He argued that there is no purpose in lobbying to reverse the Hefce cuts, unless one can persuade the electorate to accept a possible income tax rise of from 5p to 10p in the pound and place HE at the top of spending priorities.</p>	
Noted:	He saw that L McCafferty was shaking his head.	
Noted:	L McCafferty argued that it was totally wrong to say that there was no money. He pointed to the Trident Programme, the rebuilding of the prison system; the government had money to spend it was just not spending it on students. He noted the billions in taxes that the rich avoid in this country.	
Noted:	<p>Prof Ward agreed that it was frustrating that certain peers of the realm avoided taxes, the problem was that the questioner was asking the right question to the wrong person.</p> <p>He would argue passionately that HE should be in the mix as to spending priorities but there was no way it could be the top priority. In education, HE would be the poor relation for a long time to come. He argued that this was what the British people thought and noted that we live in a democracy.</p>	
Noted:	Andrew Taylor (Publicity Officer) noted the earlier	

	<p>comments about the difficulty of establishing a UEA view but wondered whether the University's top management had become too isolated. He thought that UEA could make more use of those of its academics who are renowned for their research into participatory decision making and who are regularly consulted by government.</p> <p>Noted: Prof Ward agreed UEA had influential academics in this field. However, even if a decision was made as to a single UEA voice, it would be decision making in a vacuum. He argued that the result of a participatory decision making process would be the production of a statement by UEA of spectacular blandness that would be sent to various bodies who would ignore it. He predicted that they would ignore it because there is no political consensus on maintaining present levels of HE funding.</p> <p>Noted: S Alder (MTH PG) noted that he had heard that the 94 Group had suggested that research funding should be changed so that research is mainly conducted at the top universities.</p> <p>Noted: Prof Ward confirmed that this was the case. The 94 Group, to which UEA belongs, want PG research funding basically denied to all universities whose PGR intensity figure falls below a certain level, a level that all 94 Group universities are above. He thought that the use of PGR intensity as a measurement had thrown up some interesting questions but they were not enough to clothe the nakedness of the grasping for funds by the 94 Group.</p> <p>Noted: He concluded his presentation by noting, that to avoid any ambiguity, he could not guarantee the proposed debate with the UCU until after he had checked his diary and spoken to the Executive team.</p> <p>Noted: Chair thanked Prof Ward for his presentation.</p>	
<p><b>1005</b></p>	<p><u>MEMBERSHIP</u></p> <p>Noted: That new members have been appointed and their names placed in the register.</p> <p>Noted: That 7 members missed two meetings in a semester, as per the change to the constitution, and ceased to hold office.</p> <p>Resolved: Requests from M Reed (Swimming), H McMullen (LAW 2YR UG), and L Woodhead (Cheerleading) to remain members of Council to which Council agreed nem con.</p>	

<p><b>1006</b></p> <p>Received:</p> <p>Noted:</p> <p>Resolved:</p>	<p><u>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 FEBRUARY 2010</u></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2010.</p> <p>C Clarke (PHI Board of Study) reported that he had sent apologies for his absence and these had not been minuted.</p> <p>With the addition of C Clarke's apologies, to confirm the minutes as a true and accurate recording of the meeting.</p>	<p>AM</p>
<p><b>1007</b></p> <p>Noted:</p>	<p><u>MATTERS ARISING</u></p> <p>R Archer, with permission of Council, noted that the Pro-Vice Chancellor's talk had been informative but was a slight whitewash intended to make Council think there was nothing they could do to stop the cuts. The reason Prof Ward had come to Council was because of yesterday's demonstration. Direct action does succeed as the case of strike action at Leeds, London Met and Tower Hamlets had also shown. She urged Councillors and their constituents to get involved in the campaign against the cuts and to come to the debate between Prof Ward and the UCU.</p>	
<p><b>1008</b></p> <p>Noted:</p> <p>Noted:</p>	<p><u>APPOINTMENTS TO UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES</u></p> <p>Chair noted there are no vacant posts on University Committees but there are two Faculty Convenor posts vacant. (SCI and FOH) He proposed if there were no objections, that those students elected to the posts at the forthcoming elections be asked to take up their duties immediately to cover the vacancies.</p> <p>There were no objections to the proposal.</p>	
<p><b>1009</b></p> <p>Received:</p> <p>Noted:</p> <p>Resolved:</p>	<p><u>EXECUTIVE ACTION PLAN (EAP) REPORT</u></p> <p>The Executive Report on the EAP.</p> <p>There were no comments on the report.</p> <p>To adopt the report nem con.</p>	
<p><b>1010</b></p> <p>Received:</p>	<p><u>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES</u></p> <p>The minutes of the Executive Committee meetings held on 4 February, 10 February and 18 February.</p>	

Resolved:	To approve the minutes of the Executive Committee, with one Councillor voting against.	
<b>1011</b>	<p data-bbox="411 306 995 338"><u>REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES</u></p> <p data-bbox="236 378 1241 483">Noted: H Speed (MED Other YR UG) that the period for applications to the Travel and Expeditions Committee had now closed.</p> <p data-bbox="236 524 1257 853">Noted: S Simeza (AHP PG) reported from the FOH LTQC. He noted that graduates from some Masters programmes may register and become fellows of the Higher Education Academy. He reported that staff had been reminded that any student surveys should be channelled through the Dean of Students Office. The Faculty will be starting a programme, using text messaging to help support newly arrived students. Plagiarism and the start of the Masters programme being moved forward were also discussed.</p> <p data-bbox="236 893 1241 1070">Noted: S Amin-Tilly (HIS Board of Study) reported that she recently sat on Senate Disciplinary Committee case and it was underlined to her, and she would urge Councillors to emphasise to their constituents, that all students that appear before the committee have a right of appeal.</p>	
<b>1012</b>	<p data-bbox="411 1117 1158 1184"><u>ISSUES TO BE RAISED BY MEMBERS OF UNION COUNCIL</u></p> <p data-bbox="236 1225 1257 1514">Noted: P Drew (Table Football) reported that students had experienced difficulty accessing the portal to find house mates. T Sutton (Welfare Officer) noted that he was aware of the problem and that he was meeting with the Student Support Services Manager and the Home Run administrator to try to resolve it. He would update Council on the results of the meeting.</p> <p data-bbox="236 1554 1257 1621">Noted: N Morgan (Nightline) reported that Nightline will be holding its one day intensive training on the next Sunday.</p>	
<b>1013</b>	<p data-bbox="411 1666 1126 1733"><u>CLUB, SOCIETY AND PEER SUPPORT GROUP CONSTITUTIONS</u></p> <p data-bbox="236 1774 1257 2027">Received: That a standard constitution had been received from: (a) UEA Friends of Médecin Sans Frontières (MSF) whose objects shall be: “to promote awareness of the actions of all MSF students to all UEA students.” (b) The Quaker Society whose objects shall be: “to enrich the spiritual life of the University by sharing Quaker faith and by commitment to Quaker values of truth, equality,</p>	

	<p>simplicity and peace.”  (c) Stop the Traffic UEA whose objects shall be: “to campaign against human trafficking and raise the awareness of UEA students of this issue.”</p> <p>Resolved: To approve the constitutions of the above, nem con.</p> <p>Received: A proposal from the Oriental Music Society that they change their name to the Asian Pop Entertainments Society.</p> <p>Noted: M Jopp noted that there was a possible overlap as the Asian Society and other societies promoting Asian culture refer to pop music in their constitutions.</p> <p>Resolved: To approve the change of name, with three abstentions.</p>	
<b>1014</b>	<p><u>ELECTION OF DELEGATE TO NUS WOMEN'S CONFERENCE</u></p> <p>Received: A proposal from the Communications Officer that a delegate to the NUS Women's Conference be elected.</p> <p>Noted: Chair proposed that Councillors who self-define as women should elect a delegate after the meeting of Council had ended.  He noted that the conference was due to take place at the same time as UUEAS elections.  No Councillor indicated that they would put themselves forward for election.</p> <p>Received: A request from T Sutton (Welfare Officer) that Council elect two members to an ad hoc committee to decide the winners of the Union Awards.</p> <p>Resolved: To elect Natasha Ross (Creative Writing) and Duncan Smith (CHE 2 YR UG) nem con.</p>	
<b>1015</b>	<p><u>NUS National Conference</u></p> <p>Received: A paper from the Communications Officer containing recommendations for motions and amendments for Union Council to send to NUS National Conference.</p> <p>Noted: N Barnes (Communications Officer) noted that amendments and motions to the conference have to be approved by individual unions' governing bodies, in UUEAS' case, Union Council.  She pointed out that there is a limit of 1,400 words on what each union could send to conference.</p>	

	<p>Chair proposed that as it would be impractical to vote on each change of wording in this meeting, Council should either pass or fail the amendments and motions proposed by the Communications Officer and the three Union resolutions from Union Councillors that also propose amendments to send to conference. The Communications Officer and himself would then composite the material tomorrow morning. The matter had to be resolved so urgently as the deadline for submissions was 5 pm tomorrow. He would welcome the help of any Councillor who wished in the compositing.</p> <p>A Taylor (Ethical Issues Officer) proposed that this should be decided by election.</p>	
Resolved:	That L Biscoe (LGBT Campaign Convenor) and C Clarke will assist in the compositing.	
Received:	An amendment from Andrew Taylor to the proposed new resolution entitled Free Education For All. The amendment proposed a Robin Hood Tax on financial transactions to help fund education.	
Resolved:	To accept the amendment and amended resolution with one abstention.	
Resolved:	To accept the Communications Officer's recommended amendment to Resolution 606: ICT and Technology Enhanced Learning nem con.	
Noted:	<p>On 609 Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) which it was proposed to delete and add a resolution opposing its introduction, P Gearing (Tai Kwondo) asked what HEAR was.</p> <p>D Sheppard (Academic Officer) explained that it was a proposal to add items like voluntary work and work experience to the basic degree transcript. UUEAS should oppose its introduction as it privileges students with lots of free time.</p>	
Resolved:	To accept the Communications Officer's recommended new motion to replace 609 nem con.	
Resolved:	<p>To accept the Communications Officer's recommended amendments to:</p> <p>707 Ethical Purchasing and Procurement.</p> <p>708 Changing Environmental Behaviours nem con.</p> <p>709 Fighting Climate Change nem con.</p> <p>710 Global Justice Educating Our Members with one abstentions.</p> <p>903 Private Rented Sector nem con.</p>	

	<p>918 Transport nem con.  921 Student Parents nem con.  922 Supporting Our Diverse Membership with three abstentions.</p>	
Received:	A resolution from M Schulz (Women's Campaign Convenor) and L McCafferty (Socialist Worker) on NUS DEMOCRACY proposing an amendment to motion 803.	
Noted:	<p>M Schulz, proposing the resolution, argued that the amendment would bring the motion in line with policy passed by Council. The cuts to the size of delegations meant that ordinary students, especially those from liberation groups, could not participate in conference. More broadly, the amendment would help facilitate the active involvement of every student.</p> <p>T Sutton, against, argued that the sections the amendment proposed to delete were not against Union policy. He noted that the amendment proposed encouraging general meetings which UUEAS had got rid of ten years ago. General meetings fit a past demographic of full time students aged 18-21; this had changed. He was surprised that the proposal came from the Women's Campaign Convenor as some of her constituents, mothers, cannot make Union Council or general meetings because of caring commitments. Women do not find the male debating culture at these meetings accessible. The amendment's attack on the Students' Union Evaluation Initiative (SUEI) was misguided as SUEI was valuable in improving accessibility and diversity. If passed, this resolution could set UUEAS back twenty years.</p>	
Noted:	M Schulz, in favour, noted that she was very aware of women who could not attend meetings because of caring responsibilities. The task should be to make meetings more accessible by improving nursery and bursary provision.	
Noted:	Matthew Taylor, for clarification, asked why T Sutton thought general meetings were not accessible.	
Noted:	T Sutton argued that because they were at a certain time and place a lot of students would be excluded. He noted that surveys and focus groups were far more accessible.	
Noted:	Chair named M Jopp, Finance Officer, for shouting during the meeting.	
Received:	An amendment from L Biscoe to keep the additions and remove the deletions and insertions proposed in the resolution.	
Noted:	L Biscoe, proposing, argued that general meetings are not ideal and it was too restricting to specify them as a means of action in the resolution. However, the proposed additions were in line with the policy that Council had	

Noted:	passed and would help broaden NUS democracy. L McCafferty, against, argued that the key to the resolution was to encourage active involvement, if the proposed insertions were removed, this would be lost. Importantly, the crucial idea that unions are vehicles for the collective action of the members would be rejected.	
Received:	A motion to move to a vote on the amendment.	
Resolved:	To move to vote nem con.	
Resolved:	To adopt the amendment by an overwhelming majority.	
Received:	An amendment to delete Notes 2.	
Noted:	D Sheppard (Academic Officer), proposing, noted that Notes 2 criticises SUEI and calls online voting undemocratic. If this passed, he would not be able to look nursing and midwifery students in the eye again. These students who, on placement, sometimes work 9am to 9 pm cannot come to general meetings and would be disenfranchised.	
Noted:	L Biscoe, accepted the amendment.	
Noted:	M Jopp, against the resolution, declared an interest as a NUS trustee. He pointed Council to the reason that the delegation sizes had been cut to conference; this was the financial cost of conference to the NUS, an organisation which had been struggling financially. The reduction in conference costs had allowed NUS to put more resources into campaigning. It was generally acknowledged that these changes had increased the effectiveness of NUS campaigns.	
Noted:	L Biscoe, in summation, noted that when Council had passed policy on NUS delegation size, it had resolved to send a motion to the NUS and that this would be a realisation of that commitment.	
Resolved:	To adopt the resolution by an overwhelming majority, with 4 votes against and 5 abstentions.	
Received:	A resolution, Re-affiliation to Stop The War and a consequent amendment to NUS National Conference motion 706 from L McCafferty (Socialist Worker Student Soc) and Matthew Taylor (PSI YR2 UG)	
Noted:	Chair noted the proposer and seconder had been changed prior to the meeting. He, further noted, that they had agreed to R Archer making the speech to propose the resolution. In this case, Council would need to give its permission to R Archer, as a non-member.	
Resolved:	To allow R Archer to speak nem con.	
Noted:	R Archer, proposing, noted the important job the Stop the War coalition does in supporting and protecting students who are involved in anti-war protests and campaigns. She argued that government intrusion on campus had increased and Stop the War had worked to expose this	

	and support students threatened by state spying. NUS had been affiliated to Stop the War in the past and with STW's increasing role in defending students it was now time to renew affiliation.	
Received:	An amendment from T Sutton to delete Resolves 1.	
Noted:	T Sutton, proposing, noted that he did not want Councillors to vote on something they had not read. This was the statement by United Against Islamophobia, the subject of Resolves 1, which had only just been distributed at the meeting.	
Noted:	L McCafferty, against, asked for time to read out the statement to Council.	
Noted:	Chair ruled that this would need to be granted by Council.	
Resolved:	To not give the speaker extra time to read the statement.	
Noted:	L McCafferty, argued that to delete Resolves 1 would take away the major reason why affiliation was now so important: the growth of Islamophobia. He asked Councillors to quickly read the important parts of the statement and come to a judgement.	
Resolved:	That the amendment fell by a large majority.	
Noted:	P Gearing (Tai Kwondo) against the resolution, noted that he regretted speaking against as he abhorred Islamophobia and would support a motion against any state tracking of students. However, he had no objection to the war on terror. He agreed with the principles in the statement but did not think that the position of Stop the War was the only way to promote them. It would be preferable to have a statement against Islamophobia without forcing people who are in sympathy with this aim from supporting a particular political position about the war.	
Noted:	R Archer, in summation, noted that Stop the War was an organisation with a proven record of outreach and ability to gather support against Islamophobia. She also reminded Council that it had policy against the state tracking of and spying on students, and it was important that this was sent to conference.	
Resolved:	To adopt the resolution, with a large number of abstentions.	
Received:	A resolution, NUS and Education, and consequent amendments to NUS National Conference motions 601 and 611 from M Taylor (PSI YR2 UG) and J Kiffin (Societies Officer).	
Noted:	Chair ruled that the resolution would be taken in two parts, with first a debate on the resolution and then a vote on whether to have the general meeting proposed in the resolution.	
Received:	An amendment that "to call a general meeting to discuss	

<p>Noted:</p> <p>Noted:</p> <p>Noted:</p> <p>Noted:</p> <p>Noted:</p> <p>Noted:</p> <p>Resolved:</p>	<p>this motion” be made explicit and added as Resolves 2 was accepted by the proposer.</p> <p>After taking advice from the Communications Officer that a general meeting could only feasibly be called after the Easter break, Chair noted that the meeting would be held under the new constitution: it would have a quorum of 500 and if quorate would have the power to make policy.</p> <p>L Biscoe noted that the numbering in the proposed amendments did not correspond to the numbering in the resolution to conference that Council had approved earlier.</p> <p>Chair noted that this was because the proposed amendments were to the resolution on the NUS agenda not to the earlier resolution passed by Council. If the proposed amendments were passed, he ruled that it would be the task of the Councillors appointed to undertake the compositing to reconcile them with the earlier resolution.</p> <p>M Jopp noted that some Councillors were concerned about many students not being able to attend a general meeting. However, he noted that Executive have the power to call a general meeting in several locations and the practicalities would be investigated.</p> <p>That the proposer withdrew Resolves 2 to call a general meeting. Chair, noted, that as there was now only one part to the resolution, his previous ruling to take the question in parts was redundant.</p> <p>M Taylor, proposing, argued that the amendments proposed to send to conference would make available a diversity of tactics to the student movement.</p> <p>To adopt the resolution, with a large number of abstentions.</p>	
<p>Noted:</p> <p>Received:</p> <p>Noted:</p>	<p>D Sheppard, apologised to Council, that he had not raised this item earlier but he drew Council’s attention to the research the Executive were doing, partly through the UUEAS Annual Survey, into hidden and additional course costs that students incurred. He asked Councillors for any examples that they or the constituents might know of. Councillors reported the following examples: lab coats, lab books, Criminal Records Bureau checks, printing and photocopying (particularly for presentations).</p> <p>A call of quorum.</p> <p>A count revealed, that Council was quorate by one.</p>	
<p>Received:</p> <p>Noted:</p> <p>Noted:</p>	<p>A procedural motion from J Kiffin that resolution 1020, Against Education Cuts, be moved to the top of the agenda.</p> <p>J Kiffin, proposing, noted this item was time sensitive and due to pressure of business had not been heard at the last meeting.</p> <p>J Allen (Amnesty International) noted he had a resolution on the agenda aimed at speeding up Council business, if</p>	

Resolved:	passed it would solve this problem. To adopt the procedural motion.	
Noted:	In a point of clarification a questioner from the floor asked whether the letter mentioned in Executive Item 1984, condemning Leeds SU Executive had been sent. Chair, clarified that it was his understanding that Executive had subsequently decided that they would need the mandate of Union Council to send the letter.	
Noted:	L McCafferty, proposing, argued that, although the Leeds UCU had now won a partial victory, industrial action to defend HE jobs would be more common in the future. This motion was important as it would set a precedent for future action. He drew attention to Notes 4 which was the key to the resolution, the highlighting of tactic of divide and rule used by universities against staff and students. He argued that now was the time for Council to properly mandate Executive to write an open letter to Leeds Students' Union Executive condemning Leeds' action against the UCU.	
Received:	An amendment from M Jopp to delete "Leeds Student Union Executive was therefore" and replace with "students' unions are" in Believes 3 and in Resolves 1 to replace the wording with "to remind Leeds SU of their collectivist duties by mandating the Executive to write an open letter reminding them of their duties."	
Noted:	The proposer accepted the amendment.	
Noted:	D Sheppard, against the amended resolution, argued that it was a little dangerous for Council to criticise other students' unions for their policies that had been democratically decided. A lot of other students' unions have policy opposed to UUEAS'. If other unions criticised UUEAS policy on No Platform, Council would no doubt take exception, The principle should be that students in their own union decide their own policies.	
Noted:	J Kiffin, in favour, argued that condemnation had been taken out of the resolution, it was now a reminder to other unions of the collectivist duties we all share. In the Leeds case, it was an act of friendly criticism.	
Noted:	T Sutton, against, argued that students' unions must be student led. Thousands of Leeds students had told their Executive they were unhappy with the lecturers' strike; so their Executive had a mandate to take the action. He saw no problem in this.	
Noted:	L McCafferty, in summation, argued that the previous speaker's claim was not valid: there had been more students actively involved in the counter campaign against the Leeds Executive. He contented that most Leeds students, like their counterparts across the country, were behind their lecturers taking industrial action.	
Resolved:	To adopt the amended resolution by a narrow majority.	
<b>1016</b>	<b><u>PUBLICISE UNION COUNCILLORS' VOTES</u></b>	

Received:	A resolution from J Allen (Amnesty International) and L Dorward (Environment Officer)	
Noted:	J Allen, proposing, argued that Councillors represented their constituents and that in a democratic system it was important constituents knew how their Councillor had voted. He would be accepting an amendment from Myles Smith on an electronic voting system for Council which would improve the running of Council.	
Noted:	S Poursaeedi (Futsal), against, argued that it was the duty of Councillors to inform their constituents and the duty of constituents to inquire of Councillors how they voted. He had grave concerns about posting how Councillors voted online. This information could be seen by employers and police monitoring units. His principle would be that an anonymous democracy is an honest democracy.	
Noted:	Myles Smith (ENV 2YR UG), in favour, argued that easy to use electronic systems were available which could count and record votes. He had researched a system that would cost around £5,200. Together with a software programme he had developed, this would make Council meetings far more efficient and more accessible to members. The cost might appear prohibitive but it was less than is spent on Derby Day for example.	
Noted:	C Clarke, against, argued that, though he welcomed the electronic improvements proposed, he thought votes should not be recorded. If they were recorded this could lead to the development of a whip system to the detriment of Councillors' independence.	
Noted:	Chair, noted the constitutional importance of Council being quorate. Having noted several people leave the room, he requested a count of voting members. Council was found to be inquorate and Chair closed the meeting.	

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD  
ON THURSDAY 25 FEBRUARY 2010**

**Voting Members Present:** L Dorward (EVO), T Sutton (WO), J Kiffin (SO)  
A Thomlinson (SPO), U Onyeka (EQO), D Sheppard (AO).

**In Attendance:** A Moore (RSW), A Pott (GM).

**Apologies for absence:** M Jopp (FO), A Taylor (PO), R Kalra (IO).

**Chair:** N Barnes (CO)

<b>2012</b>	<u>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18 FEBRUARY 2010</u>	
Received:	The minutes of the meeting held on 18 February 2010.	
Resolved:	The minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting.	
<b>2013</b>	<u>MATTERS ARISING</u>	
Noted:	EVO inquired about the results for Meat Free Monday, as to whether there had been an increase in sales. GM advised there had been a marginal increase with UUEAS giving away £35 in discounts but he believed that this was on food that would have been bought anyway by vegetarians.	
<b>2014</b>	<u>ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP</u>	
Received:	An application from the Circus Society on behalf of Caroline Poole for Associate Membership of UUEAS.	
Resolved:	To approve the application.	<b>AM</b>
<b>2015</b>	<u>NATIONAL DAY OF ACTION AGAINST FEES AND FUNDING CUTS</u>	
Received:	A written proposal and funding request from the Communications Officer on behalf of Rachel Archer.	
Noted:	AO noted that there was plenty of paint supplies for the group to use, so the only cost would be for the banners. Chair noted that sheets could be brought from a charity shop.	

<p>Resolved:</p> <p>Noted:</p> <p>Resolved:</p>	<p>To provide funds for two sheets from a charity shop.</p> <p>GM queried who had called the day of action. Chair noted that it had been organised by a broad coalition of left wing groups. Chair noted that R Archer had asked Executive to publicise the event and also to support the event in person. GM advised that it should be clarified as to what “then move on to the VC’s office” meant in the proposal. SO noted that if the event did turn in to an occupation that would be in line with Union policy. He further noted that publicising an event did not necessarily mean supporting it. GM advised that it would be useful to know what the protesters intentions were before making a decision to publicise it and implicitly endorse it. AO noted that this was an independent student campaign where Executive could not tell the members what to do, Executive’s involvement should be limited to supplying the paint and some posters. SPO noted that it should be publically minuted that Executive would support the protest providing it stayed outside the building. SO noted that it was Union policy to support all peaceful, non-criminal occupations; so long as this event stayed within the law, then Executive was bound to support it.</p> <p>To publicise the banner painting in the Square and a teach in on the National Day of Action. To fund the printing of posters and leaflets that the activists will design themselves. To publicise R Archer’s e-mail address. To support the protesters in the event of an occupation.</p>	<p><b>NB</b></p>
<p><b>2016</b></p> <p>Received:</p> <p>Noted:</p>	<p><u>GO GLOBAL</u></p> <p>A written proposal and funding request from the Welfare Officer.</p> <p>WO noted that the part of the request dealing with the International Party was redundant as he had discovered that this would come from the Entertainments Budget. The Globes requested would be for the campus wide competition, promoting diversity, that he has been working on with the DOS</p> <p>The Go Global funding request for food in the Hive depended on uptake from societies; so far there had been no response but he asked for the funding to be agreed in case there was interest.</p>	

Resolved:	To agree to the proposal and funding request of £50 for inflatable globes and of £30 to serve food in the Hive.	<b>TS</b>
<b>2017</b>	<u>GOAT 12 AND 13</u>	
Received:	The results of the Go Out And Talk surveys held on 5 February and 19 February.	
Noted:	Chair noted that students, in the question on intentions to vote in UUEAS elections, had answered they were more likely to vote if they knew one of the candidates; this meant that turnout would increase if there were a high number of candidates standing.	
<b>2018</b>	<u>UNION COUNCIL MEETING OF 11 FEBRUARY</u>	
Noted:	WO noted on the Spiking motion that he was dealing with the matters in the Resolves.	
Noted:	Officers asked why the resolution on Autonomous Campaigns Budgets had been withdrawn. GM advised that there had been questions raised as to whether it was constitutionally possible to mandate the Trustees to earmark specific amounts of money. His advice had been that one did not have to pass a resolution, Executive had the power to earmark the funds.	
<b>2019</b>	<u>MINUTES OF THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE</u>	
Received:	The minutes of the Management Committee meetings of 2 and 16 February 2010.	
Resolved:	To adopt the decisions of the Management Committee.	
<b>2020</b>	<u>TIME, DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING</u>	
Resolved:	That the next meeting will take place at 5.00 pm on Wednesday 3 March in the Board Room. That items for the agenda should reach the Representation Support Worker by 9.00am on Monday 1 March 2009.	

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON  
WEDNESDAY 3 MARCH 2010

**Voting Members Present:** L Dorward (EVO), T Sutton (WO), J Kiffin (SO)  
A Thomlinson (SPO), U Onyeka (EQO), M Jopp  
(FO), D Sheppard (AO).

**In Attendance:** A Moore (RSW), A Pott (GM), R Reynolds.

**Apologies for absence:** A Taylor (PO), R Kalra (IO).

**Chair:** N Barnes (CO)

<b>2021</b>	<u>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 FEBRUARY 2010</u>	
Received:	The minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2010.	
Resolved:	The minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting.	
<b>2022</b>	<u>MATTERS ARISING</u>	
Noted:	There were no matters arising.	
<b>2023</b>	<u>UNION COUNCIL AGENDA</u>	
Noted:	Executive discussed the agenda for the meeting of Union Council to be held on Thursday, 4 March.	
<b>2024</b>	<u>TIME, DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING</u>	
Resolved:	That the next meeting will take place at 9.30am on Thursday 11 March in the Board Room. That items for the agenda should reach the Representation Support Worker by 9.00am on Tuesday 9 March 2009.	
Noted:	Chair welcomed back M Jopp to Executive on his return from illness.	

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY 18 MARCH 2010

**Voting Members Present:** N Barnes, M Jopp, D Sheppard, T Sutton, L Dorward,

U Onyeka, A Thomlinson.

**In attendance:** A Pott.

<b>2032</b>	<u>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 3 MARCH 2010</u>	<b>ACTION</b>
Received:	The minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2010.	
Confirmed:	The minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting.	
Noted:	That the meeting on 11 March 2010 failed to reach a quorum.	
<b>2033</b>	<u>MATTERS ARISING</u>	
Noted:	That there were no matters arising not covered elsewhere on the agenda.	
<b>2034</b>	<u>BY-ELECTION TIMETABLE</u>	
Received:	A proposal from the Communications Officer (copy placed in minute book).	
Resolved:	To approve the timetable subject to the possibility of holding an additional training session if candidates were unable to attend either of the proposed meetings because of academic commitments.	
<b>2035</b>	<u>UNION COUNCIL MEETING</u>	
Received:	The agenda of the Union Council Meeting held on 4 March 2010 (circulated separately).	
Noted:	That accessing the new Home Run Website was cumbersome.	
Resolved:	That the website working group be asked to investigate the problem and introduce a simpler system for the future.	
Resolved:	That the Chairman of Council should represent the Union at the NUS Conference compositing meeting.	

<b>2036</b>	<u>COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER</u>	
Received:	A proposal and funding request from the Academic Officer (copy placed in minute book).	
Resolved:	To approve the proposal subject to great care being taken to ensure that the content was not politically biased.	
<b>2037</b>	<u>BANNERS IN THE HIVE</u>	
Received:	A proposal from the Environment Officer that clubs, societies and peer support groups should be allowed to hang banners from the balcony surrounding the Hive.	
Resolved:	To approve the proposal subject to the banners being inflammable and their wording, length of time displayed and the amount of space allocated being decided by the Communications and Finance Officers subject to an appeal to the Student Officer Committee.	<b>NB/MJ</b>
<b>2038</b>	<u>CUTS AT THE STUDENT LOANS COMPANY</u>	
Received:	A proposal from the Communications Officer to support the employees trades union and send a letter to the company.	<b>NB</b>
<b>2039</b>	<u>EXECUTIVE ACTION PLAN</u>	
Received:	A copy of the Executive Action Plan containing progress in February (copy placed in minute book).	
Resolved:	That the Go Green section of commitment A5 should be shown as green, to note that a sports week had been organised after the exams in the commentary on commitment D5, that commitment D5 should be shown as green and commitment E3 shown as red.	
<b>2040</b>	<u>MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES</u>	
Received:	Minutes of the Management Committee meetings held on Tuesday 2 March and Tuesday 9 March 2010 (copy placed in minute book).	
<b>2041</b>	<u>TIME, DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING</u>	
Noted:	That this was the last meeting for the current part time officers and to record the thanks of the full time officers for their contribution to the Union.	
Resolved:	That the Communications Officer would seek an appropriate time and date for the first meeting of the Student Officer Committee.	<b>NB</b>

To: Union Council  
From: Communications Officer  
Subject: NUS National Conference 2010

---

This years National Conference was held at the Sage in Newcastle Gateshead.

Representing UEA was Liz Biscoe, Richard Reynolds, David Sheppard, Dan Youmans and Natasha Barnes.

You can find the full agenda here:

[http://resource.nusonline.co.uk/media/resource/NC2010\\_CD4\\_OrderPaperdraftv9.pdf](http://resource.nusonline.co.uk/media/resource/NC2010_CD4_OrderPaperdraftv9.pdf)

#### Day 1

- The first zone to be discussed was the Higher Education zone. Richard spoke in favour of free education during the motion 'Higher Education Funding' and all delegates voted in line with our free education policy. This amendment did not pass and NUS continue to favour a Graduate Tax. However, conference did vote to support our amendment which states 'NUS resolves to support the cuts campaign on the ground in many universities'.
- David argued in favour of our amendment submitted to the Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) motion, however the amendment fell and NUS now support the development of HEAR.
- The delegation attended the fringe event 'Widening Access; Lowering Standards'
- The next zone to be discussed was the Further Education zone.
- During the fringe break for this zone we attended 'Operation Get the Student Vote Out'.

#### Day 2

- The Welfare zone was next to be discussed and Dan took the Introduction Speech for the motion 'Neighbourhood and Community'
- Under the motion entitled 'Faith and Safety' NUS' No Platform policy was discussed. All UEA delegates voted in

line with our Union policy though NUS continue to have a No Platform Policy.

- We then heard the speeches for the Presidential election. Aaron Porter won this election.
- The Union Development zone was next to be discussed after which we heard the speeches for the Vice President Higher Education and Further Education elections, which Usman Ali and Shane Chowen won respectively.
- Next to be discussed was the Society and Citizenship zone. Natasha made the Introduction Speech to the motion 'Electoral Reform'.
- Under the motion 'Safe and Cohesive Communities' No Platform was again discussed and all delegates voted in line with the Union's policy.
- After this zone we heard the election speeches for Vice Presidents Society and Citizenship, Union Development and Welfare. Susan Nash, Ed Marsh and Ben Whittaker were elected to these positions.

### Day 3

- First were the election speeches for the Democratic Procedures Committee and Student Trustees.
- Then 3 motions of censure were dealt with. One to Wes Streeting (President) with regard to his recent visit to Israel, and one to both Bell Ribeiro-Addy (NUS' Black Students' Officer) and Daf Adley (NUS' LGBT Officer) due to Durham Students' Union's recent disaffiliation to NUS. Only the motion to censure Bell passed. UEA delegates voted for the motion to censure Wes but against the other two.
- The Annual General Meeting came next and delegation cuts were discussed under the motion 'Defend the Diversity of National Conference'. We all voted in favour of moving back to 2009 delegation entitlements yet this motion fell.
- Conference also agreed under this motion that there shall be no difference between full-time and part-time students when deciding delegation sizes for Unions though this will need to be ratified at next years National Conference as it means a change to NUS' Constitution. Our delegation size may be even smaller in 2012.
- We then heard election speeches for the Block of 15.

## **Publicise Union Councillors' Votes**

Proposed by Josh Allen (Amnesty International Soc - joshua.allen@uea.ac.uk) Seconded by (to be confirmed)

### **Union Notes:**

- That Union Councillors are the instruments of democracy in the Union, representing the views of their constituents in Union Council.

- That the way Union Councillors represent their constituents in Council is through their votes and the motions they bring forward.

- That at present there is no feedback mechanism between Union Councillors and their constituents, i.e. while non-Councillors can attend Council meetings, it should be the responsibility of the Councillors to be accountable to their constituents without inconvenience to these constituents; also, it is physically impossible for all constituents to fit into a Lecture Theatre.

- That MP's votes are publicised so that their constituents can contact them to express agreement / disagreement with their voting record and make informed decisions in elections (see <http://www.publicwhip.org.uk/>).

- That often Union Council is prolonged by the counting of close votes and the counting of quorum. If the voting on each motion were faster, more motions could be passed in one session.

- That the recent constitutional amendments did not attempt to restructure Council, despite it being the fundamental link between students and the Union.

### **Union Believes:**

- That the only way Council can be truly democratic is if constituents are aware of their representatives' votes and motions.

- That the current system does not encourage Councillors to consult their constituents before voting or raising motions.

- That, as the most important policy making body in the Union, Union Council must be as democratic and representative as possible.

**Union Resolves:**

- To introduce an electronic voting system whereby all votes would be automatically recorded and displayed on-screen at the front of the Lecture Theatre. These votes will then be published to the Union website, with a separate section for each Councillor's voting record.

- To ensure that constituents are made aware of this new feedback mechanism through notification on the Union website, posters, leaflets etc.

## **Ethical Banking Motion**

Proposer-William Lacey

Seconder- Sarah Waterfield

### **The Union notes:-**

- The Royal Bank of Scotland-NatWest, the self proclaimed “oil and gas bank”, had equivalent embedded emissions equal to the whole of the UK economy in all of its projects\*.
- The NUS has written to RBS condemning it’s funding of oil and gas extraction and exploration and threatening to move banks
- This union banks with NatWest, as do large numbers of students.
- That some banks have adopted stringent environmental and ethical policies.
- Barclays has also been linked to the arms trade and rainforest destruction.
- The UK tax payer now owns a controlling majority share in RBS-NatWest.

### **The Union believes:-**

- In consumer pressure to bring about positive change
- That funding and supporting fossil fuel extraction and exploration leads to long term carbon dioxide emissions and climate change
- That banks that fund new fossil fuel projects and exploration for fossil fuels are incompatible with UUEAS environmental policy
- That banking with an ethical bank upholds our environmental policy
- That an optimal bank is one that has adopted stringent environmental and ethical policies but is still cost effective.

### **The Union resolves:-**

- To bank with an optimal bank
- To mandate the Communications Officer to write to the chairman of RBS-NatWest and the Chancellor of the Treasury

- a. informing him of our commitment to the environment, and expressing our view that this commitment is incompatible with significant parts of RBS's investment strategies.
  - b. calling for RBS-NatWest to immediately stop investing in projects and companies that destroy fragile and irreplaceable eco-systems.
  - c. calling for RBS-NatWest to refuse to finance businesses or ventures that fail to uphold human rights or have close links to oppressive regimes.
  - d. calling for RBS-NatWest to set and publish annual reduction targets for the emissions resulting from lending to fossil fuel projects and companies.
  - e. calling for RBS-NatWest to prioritise lending to low-carbon companies, technologies and infrastructure
  - f. to inform them that we shall consider a more optimal bank if RBS does not substantially cut their commitment to investing in fossil fuel extraction and exploration programmes.
- To boycott RBS-NatWest if they do not meet these demands by August 2010.
  - To strengthen the Environmental and Ethical Questionnaire as part of the Bank Tender process.

\*

<http://www.platformlondon.org/carbonweb/documents/royalbankofsustainability.pdf>

## Going Greener UEA

**Proposed:** Andrew Taylor, People and Planet

**Seconded:** William Lacey, Environment Officer

---

### Union notes:

1. As a result of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions key components of the climate system are becoming increasingly stressed, with both the mean ocean and air temperatures rising along with an intensification of the hydrological cycle (IPCC, 2001, 2007; Barnett et al, 2005; D'Arrigo, 2006; Osborn and Briffa, 2006, Treydte, 2006).
2. Peak oil is looming, not the end of oil, but certainly the end of cheap oil. Reduction in supply and continued demand will inevitably lead to escalating prices, which will leave oil-dependent organisations with serious economic consequences.
3. Currently the global economy is tied into a dependence on oil and other fossil fuels.
4. The UK government is legally committed to an 80% reduction in greenhouse emissions by 2050. However, a body of research is growing that even with these dramatic reductions the inertia in the system will take the climate system past a tipping point where large carbon stores and sinks, which overshadow the carbon stored in fossil fuels, will be irreversibly released.
5. To meet these targets, university funding in England has now been directly linked to carbon reductions as part of the Higher Education Funding Council of England's (hefce) Carbon Management Strategy (hefce, 2010).
6. Over 50% of the HE sectors CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are related to procurement, these emissions will be included in the 80% reduction targets (hefce, 2010).
7. The students union currently does not have representation on UEAs Planning and Resources committee, which makes decisions that have a large effect UEAs carbon emission.
8. There are large amounts of funding available for businesses such as the Students Union Services Ltd (up to £600,000) in the form of

- interest free loans to help facilitate a transition to a low carbon economy (Carbon Trust, UEA Revolving Green Fund).
9. Current plans to change light bulbs in the student union bar (agreed in 2007/08) that would save the SU over £1000 a year have not been implemented due to a lack of staff resources to manage this process, there are many other similar projects.
  10. The transition town movement is a rapidly expanding grass roots movement aimed at tackling the twin problems of climate change and peak oil in a holistic manner.
  11. Union council passed a Transition Campus motion in 2007/8.
  12. The transition model encourages participation and takes into account psychological barriers to change, encouraging individual and communal wellbeing in parallel with action.
  13. There are also structural elements though which inhibit pro-environmental behaviour. These can take the form of direct barriers to access resources (no recycling bins available) to motivational barriers (one choice in ten on a menu is a vegetarian option).
  14. Previous student led environmental campaigns have focused on challenging these structural barriers at UEA by driving the university to increase the level of resources put in to reducing the institutions impact, monitoring current impacts and making commitments for improvement.
  15. These campaigns have been highly successful and have led to:
    - UEA accepting an environment policy developed by over 300 students.
    - Employing a full time environment manager.
    - A comprehensive environmental audit.
    - Significant time-bound targets for the reduction of specific environmental impacts.
    - A carbon reduction strategy to cut UEA's total carbon emissions by levels significantly ahead of government targets.
    - An agreement to monitor business air travel with a view to stopping expenses for short haul flights.

- The development of an environmental and ethical, procurement policy.
  - An inter-departmental E&E competition.
16. UEA has signed up to the Degrees Cooler program. They are one of 20 universities who are part of this scheme which is focused on pro-environmental behaviour change. The scheme is run by NUS with partner organisation; Student Switch Off, EAUC, LSx, People & Planet and Student Force.
17. The Degrees Cooler program is funded by the Department for the Environment and Rural Affairs (defra) and is a pilot project which will be linked to much wider funding if good results are achieved.
18. The Going Greener campaign element of Degrees Cooler is a grass-roots student led campaign which will vary at each institution it takes place. It is based on the Transition Town movement and Go Green campaign, focusing on removing barriers and encouraging behaviours in four areas; food, transport, waste and energy.

**Union believes:**

1. As individuals and an institution we have a social and ecological responsibility to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
2. The Transition Model will help the Students Union and UEA to meet the 80% reduction target and beyond.
3. Unless the Students Union and UEA are weaned off oil there will be considerable implications both socially and economically for students and the university as a whole.
4. Many students feel very strongly about climate change and seeing, wasteful and non-progressive practices on campus can lead to a diminished student experience.
5. University funding is now linked to their performance in reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, meaning that tackling climate change on our campus now directly affects students as students.
6. Attempts by the university to work towards sustainability should be encouraged, but should also be integrated into a wider holistic approach to sustainability of the campus.

7. Students have led on the sustainability agenda at UEA for a number of years and should continue to do so with commitment from the Students Union.
8. The students union would benefit from savings in energy bills.
9. The student voice on sustainability should be represented on all of the universities committees and contribute to UEAs carbon management strategy.
10. The students union should engage with diverse sections of the UEA community to develop a positive and inclusive, vision of a low-carbon UEA.
11. Students on a national level should have a key role in delivering the low-carbon future that will save guard our future wellbeing.
12. The union of UEA students should support the Going Greener campaign, in order to secure further funding off defra for student led environmental campaigning.

**Union resolves:**

1. To support the Going Greener UEA process, through an educational campaign about peak oil and climate change.
2. To set an example in each of the following areas and remove barriers the students union will:
  - Waste: mandate the executive to work towards removing all non-reusable non-recyclable plastic glasses in the bars and lcr.
  - Transport: hold a termly 'Reward a Cyclist Day' where students who cycle in will receive a free cup of tea or coffee from the Hive.
  - Food: hold a termly 'Meat Free Monday' when the Bar, Hive and UFO will sell discounted vegetarian options.
  - Energy: employ an environmental member of staff (not necessarily fulltime) who can reduce the union's energy consumption and apply for grants.
3. To lobby the university to:
  - Offer a free low-carbon breakfast for cyclist on 'Reward a Cyclist Day'.
  - Sell meat free food in Zest, Blend and staff catering on 'Meat Free Mondays'.

4. To engage students and staff to find out their vision for the future of a sustainable UEA which will be presented to the university.
5. To set aside £5000 for on campus student led environmental projects that will reduce the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of the university community while improving the student experience. £4000 will be available for students to set up projects while £1000 will be used as a prize fund for the most effective projects.
6. To lobby the university to match the £5000 fund for student led sustainability projects.
7. To lobby the university to have a student representative as a member of UEA's Planning and Resources committee.
8. To lobby the university to have termly open forums with UEA's Sustainability Committee and environmental members of staff, to discuss UEA's carbon reduction strategy.
9. To lobby the university to assess the level of sustainability in teaching and bring monitoring of sustainability in teaching into the environmental management system.

## **Union of UEA Students Procurement Policy**

Proposed: Andrew Taylor, (People and Planet)

Seconded: William Lacey , (Environment Officer)

### **Union Notes:**

1. The Union has been campaigning for the University to adopt a sustainable purchasing policy.
2. A significant amount of the Unions expenditure is spent on purchasing goods, utilities, works and services. The intention of the Policy is to use this spending power to reduce the Unions impact on the areas listed:
  - the protection of human health
  - the promotion of fair working conditions
  - the promotion of social enterprise and improving local skills
  - the promotion of the local economy and employment
  - reducing soil, water and air pollution
  - reducing energy consumption and climate change
  - reducing water consumption
  - reducing the consumption of raw materials, including packaging and waste
  - the protection of habitats and biodiversity
3. Student union support for workers in Honduras has ended with the reemployment of Honduras workers, who were sacked for trying to unionise.
4. The Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) is an independent labor rights monitoring organization, conducting investigations of working conditions in factories around the globe. Their primary focus is the labor practices of factories that make apparel and other goods bearing university logos.
5. 186 universities and colleges worldwide are affiliated to the worker rights consortium.

### **Union Believes:**

1. That the union should apply the following principles and definitions, throughout our supply chain:
  - Protecting human health including minimising our use of products that,

in themselves or in their manufacture or disposal cause pollution; promoting healthy eating in our catering provision; and encouraging exercise in the design of our buildings and transport arrangements.

- Promoting fair working conditions including dealing with suppliers (or those who purchase from other companies) who do not use forced or child labour; pay overtime above a maximum 48 hour week; provide a 'living' wage; provide freedom from bullying, racial or sexual harassment, a healthy working environment and the right to unionise.

- Promotion of social enterprise and improving local skills including encouraging local suppliers (including 'not-for-profit' community projects) to bid for appropriate supplies, works and services by advertising locally, minimising 'red-tape, and encouraging main contractors to use local sub-contractors.

- Promotion of the local economy and employment although under EU legislation it is anti-competitive to favour local suppliers directly, local business can be encouraged by specifying minimum response times in service contracts and fresh produce, where appropriate.

- Reducing soil, water and air pollution by buying products which cause less pollution in their manufacture, use and disposal.

- Reducing energy consumption and climate change by buying products that use less energy to produce and use, and avoid products and processes that generate greenhouse gases such as methane, HFCs, PFCs SF6, N2O and low-level ozone.

- Reducing water consumption by avoiding products that are water intensive in their production or use.

- Reducing the consumption of raw materials, including packaging and waste by choosing products that have a higher recycled content and/or which can be easily recycled. Minimise packaging or ensure that it is reused or recycled or, at the very least is biodegradable.

- Protection of habitats and biodiversity so avoiding products that have been produced at the expense of vulnerable habitats or species including land clearance, industrialised farming, unsustainable harvesting, etc

2. There will always be a desire from consumers for cheaper products, which will lead to factories exploiting workers.

3. The most effective way that workers can protect their rights is through collective negotiations by forming Unions.

4. The students union and university are unable to monitor to whole of their supply chains, so the most effective way for us to support workers right in our supply chains is to work with the WRC to stop anti-union activity.

### **Union Resolves:**

1. All staff with purchasing responsibilities should to consider whether apurchase:
  - Is necessary; can existing items be used or purchases be shared with other potential users, can the product be rented, or the service outsourced.
  - Will use resources efficiently during its lifetime, including whilst in use and upon disposal; have recycled products been used in its manufacture.
  - Is made using properly managed, renewable resources.
  - Is durable; can it be recharged, repaired, upgraded or reused.
  - Can be recycled at the end of its useful life.
  - Is likely to emit toxic or polluting substances during its production, use or disposal.
  - Includes excessive packaging: can any packaging be reused/recycled or is made from recycled material.
  - Can be purchased from suppliers who demonstrate a commitment to improving their sustainability performance.
  - Should the specification include sustainability issues such as a minimum energy efficiency rating, prohibition of HFCs, removal/reuse of packaging, etc.
2. The Finance Officer will:
  - Develop and maintain an action plan, based on an analysis of the Union spending, to identify priority product areas for further investigation and improvement.
  - Consider environmental, social and economic factors when appointing preferred suppliers.
  - Encourage preferred, and other key, suppliers to produce, distribute and dispose of products, packaging and waste in a more sustainable manner.
  - Provide guidance, including the use of whole life costing, to encourage staff involved in purchasing to adopt more sustainable purchasing practices particularly in respect of products which have a high impact on sustainability.
  - Develop and record appropriate performance indicators to measure sustainable purchasing targets.
  - Work with other HE bodies and the wider public sector to share experiences and circulate best practice.
  - Communicate this policy within the University community and to suppliers so that all staff and students are aware of the impact they have on the environment and society and help them minimise these impacts.

3. To lobby UEA to affiliate to the WRC.
4. To commit to contributing £500 to the affiliation of the WRC to cover monitoring of the unions supply chains.

## Affiliation to the Right to Work Campaign

Proposer: L McCafferty (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Seconder: L Glasheen (Capoeira Soc)

### **Union Notes:**

- That the economic crisis, internationally and domestically, is leading to unemployment, insecurity and devastation of communities. UK unemployment is now 2.5 million and is rising.
- Young people are particularly badly affected. One million young people are not in employment, education or training.
- That whoever gets elected is pledged to cuts in public spending of over £300 billion, which will mean huge job cuts, which will increase unemployment and decrease job prospects for graduates.
- The crisis has meant that more students are taking part-time work, which is often un-unionized poorly-paid agency work in which students are highly vulnerable to exploitation, with only around 8% of students in unions.
- That the Conference of Solidarity and Resistance organized by the Right the Work campaign last November was an attempt to bring together the various struggles into networks of resistance, and was backed by over 55 Trade Union branches, Trades Councils, Student Unions, and the UCU (University and College Union) nationally.
- That affiliation to the Right to Work Campaign would cost £30 per annum for a students' union.

### **Union Believes:**

- That the government has found hundreds of billions of pounds to bail out banks and financial institutions, but has done very little to defend workers' jobs and living standards.
- That the cuts will target ordinary people, who are not responsible for the crisis.
- That if there are to be cuts, they could be made by the cancellation of the Trident nuclear replacement and an end to tax avoidance and evasion by the rich, instead of cutting jobs and destroying public services.

- That unemployment will increase attacks on the pay and conditions of employed workers, and increase temporary and agency employment without full rights.
- That the unemployed, especially the young unemployed, and school and college leavers should be involved in demonstrations and protests for jobs.
- That the all-out strike at Tower Hamlets College has saved many courses and blocked compulsory redundancies shows that the cuts can be resisted.
- That united we are stronger, and it is necessary to unite student and workers struggles in a national movement if we are to be effective in stopping cuts.

### **Union Resolves:**

- To affiliate to the Right to Work Campaign at a cost of £30 p.a..
- To support the Right to Work Post-election conference on the 22<sup>nd</sup> May, supported and attended by John McDonnell MP, Adrian Ramsay, and the UCU Higher and Further Education Committees.
- To send delegates from the executive to the conference, and to send the union banner.

## **Appendix**

### **CVs from the applicants to be Student Trustees**

**Stephen Wilson**  
**Christopher W Lee**  
**Shanshan Yu**  
**Patrick Harding**  
**Joshua Whelan**  
**Olivia Davis**  
**Harry Mach**  
**Jonathon Lock**  
**Christopher Clarke**