



UCL UNION POLICY FILE

July 2008

Contents Page

The Policy File contains all Union Policy submitted and passed as motions at either Union Council or a General Meeting. They are organised in sections according to the Term in which they lapse, commencing with the oldest.

1. Autumn 2008.....	3
1.1. Emergency Motion to UCL Union Council on March Elections	4
1.2. ETHICAL INVESTMENT MOTION.....	5
1.3. Motion to Union Council: Election of Sports, Arts and Societies Officers.....	6
2. Spring 2009.....	7
2.1. Motion to Council to award Social Colours to Daniel Monsell	8
2.2. Motion to Union Council on Fairtrade.....	9
2.3. Motion to Union Council on Recycling.....	10
2.4. Motion to Union Council to adopt the use of the UCL Union Disciplinary Guidance.....	12
2.5. Motion to UCL Union on Climate Change	18
2.6. Renewing Lapsing Policy on FAIRTRADE	20
2.7. Renewing Policy on Nestlé Boycott.....	22
2.8. Motion Regarding UCL Union Fundraising Policy	23
2.9. Motion Against Non-Affiliation of 'Banking & Finance Networking Society'	26
3. Summer 2009.....	29
3.1. Motion to Union Council to amend the climate change motion	30
3.2. Motion to Union Council: Motion on making UCLU events more inclusive.....	32
3.3. Motion to accept Memorandum & Articles of Association and Draft Bye-Laws & Guidance Documents.....	34
3.4. Motion to UCL Union Council to Amend the Ethical investment Policy	36
3.5. Hands Off Our Union: Motion to stop the undemocratic 'governance review' ..	37
4. Autumn 2009.....	41
4.1. Motion to Council Regarding Publicity for General Meetings	42
4.2. Motion to support London Student	44
4.3. Red Alert: Urgent Action Needed on Climate Change.....	46
4.4. Motion to Amend Annual Conference Motion 701	47
4.5. Emergency Motion on 'Occupied Palestinian Territories'	49
4.6. Motion: Untitled.....	53
4.7. Motion to Stop the Deportation of Guy Njike	54
4.8. NUS Motion	56
4.9. Motion on Troops out of UCL	58
4.10. Medsin RUMS Motion for Union Council	60
4.11. Emergency Motion to Union Council	61
5. Spring 2010.....	65
5.1. Motion to Union Council: Nestlé at UCL Union.....	66
5.2. Motion to Council: Arts Colours Awards	67
5.3. Motion on the future of Senate House Library to Union Council 20 th May.....	69
5.4. Motion to Union Council: DisarmUCL and Freshers' Fayre	73
5.5. Emergency Motion to May 20 Council.....	74
5.6. Emergency Motion on Standing Orders Improvements	75

Autumn 2008

1.1. Emergency Motion to UCL Union Council on March Elections

Proposer: Isabelle Hewitt, French II
Passed: Union Council, 15th January 2007
Lapses: Autumn 2008

This union notes:

- 1) That Elections Committee has agreed to move to online voting.
- 2) That Kit-Site, our website provider, are able to provide online voting facilities for the upcoming elections for cross campus positions.
- 3) That Kit-Site are not currently able to run constituent positions.
- 4) That several part-time non-Executive Officers are constituent positions.
- 5) That UCLU is currently reviewing its Governance structure and, following a referendum, some of the current Union positions may change.

This union believes:

- 1) That the election process will be more efficiently run via online-voting.
- 2) That to run additional paper ballots for constituent positions in this round of elections would detract from the main focus.

This union resolves:

- 1) To partially suspend standing order 7.V.E.2: 'Sabbatical, Executive and the Non-Executive officers not mentioned above shall be elected in the second term preceding their office'.
- 2) To run current executive positions as per current standing orders.
- 3) That all other positions to be elected in October should the Governance referendum change, or in April should the outcome of the Governance Referendum be 'no'.

1.2. ETHICAL INVESTMENT MOTION

Proposer: Maggie Gray, History of Art PhD II
Passed: Union Council, 26th February 2007
Lapses: Autumn 2008

This union notes:

- 1) that UCL has £1,591,627 worth of shares in the arms companies Cobham plc (£845,530) and the Smiths Group (£746,097) and that these shares constitute 1.7% of its total investment assets. [source: Mrs R. H. Cummings, UCL Freedom of Information Officer, 9th August 2006]
- 2) that both of the above companies profit significantly from the sale of military products such as components for Eurofighter, Joint Strike Fighter, Hawk jets, Apache helicopters and F-16s.
- 3) that both of these companies are predominantly exporters of arms which due to the deregulation of the arms trade are sold to regimes without regard to human rights records for example Turkey, Indonesia and Israel.
- 4) that UCL has a Socially Responsible Investment (SRI) policy which prohibits investment in tobacco companies
- 5) that students at other UK universities such as SOAS, Goldsmiths, and Bangor
- 6) have successfully campaigned for divestment of their respective institutions' arms shares and that divestment is an issue of national student interest.

This union believes:

- 1) that these investments are damaging to UCL's global reputation and undermine its professed tradition of liberal values and social justice.
- 2) that as a major university UCL sets an important precedent for the whole sector and has a moral responsibility to ensure that its investments do not negatively affect society or the environment.
- 3) that ethical investment is as financially profitable as investment in arms companies as shown by the examples of Leeds University and the University of East Anglia.
- 4) that UCL should divest its shares in these arms companies and extend its SRI policy to preclude investment in arms companies.

This union resolves:

- 1) to mandate the sabbatical team to lobby the University to divest its shares in Cobham plc and the Smiths Group and extend UCL's SRI policy to preclude investments in arms companies, and make a detailed public statement regarding their progress at the start of each term.
- 2) to actively and openly support the cross-society disarmUCL campaign and allow the union's support to be included in all campaign publicity.
- 3) to mandate the Media and Communications officer to request permission to and, if granted, send a specific email to all students making them aware of UCL's investments in arms companies and the disarmUCL campaign, website and petition
- 4) to put a link to the disarmUCL petition on the UCL union website homepage
- 5) to allow disarmUCL to display their banner outside UCLU, Gordon St

1.3. Motion to Union Council: Election of Sports, Arts and Societies Officers

Proposer: Anthony Moore, Mathematics III
Passed: Union Council, 19th March 2007
Lapses: Autumn 2008

This Union Notes:

- 1) The Motion passed by Union Council dated 8 January 2007, the effect of which was to suspend all elections of Non-Executive Officers.

This Union Believes:

- 1) That the two main motivations behind the motion were that Kitsite are unable to run constituency elections and the possible effects of any change in governance structure.
- 2) That the election of Sports Officer, Arts Officer and Societies Officer do not require any online voting.
- 3) That no change in governance structure is likely during the 2007-08 Academic Year.
- 4) That members of Arts Board have expressed a clear desire to elect an Arts Officer on the usual schedule.

This Union Resolves:

- 1) To reinstate Standing Order 7.V.E.2. insofar as it applies to the election of Sports Officer, Arts Officer and Societies Officer.

Spring 2009

2.1. Motion to Council to award Social Colours to Daniel Monsell

Proposer: Zoë Davies, French Affiliate
Passed: Union Council, 21st May 2007
Lapses: Spring 2009

This Union notes:

- 1) Social Colours are awarded to individuals in recognition of outstanding contributions to the student community of UCL.
- 2) Contribution is recognised as a conscious and marked improvement in the lives of UCL students, through efforts in Union societies, voluntary work or otherwise.
- 3) Social Colours are awarded for outstanding commitment to the UCL student community.
- 4) Only individuals who can demonstrate commitment over and above any specified job description will be considered for social colours.
- 5) Examples of considerable dedication to the student community of UCL must be shown for the Social Colours Award.

This Union believes:

- 1) Daniel Monsell held the position of President of the Live Music Society 2006-07 and generated a large society and a expanded on the Live Music Night in the Union.
- 2) Daniel Monsell went above and beyond his job role to set-up and organise Live Music Events at the FlyBar.
- 3) Daniel Monsell has successfully started a profit generating and reputation building event for the Live Music Society. This event is to be a monthly event next academic year.
- 4) The event gives UCL live music community a professional stage on which to perform and has allowed the UCL live music community to expand and widen its horizons.

This Union resolves:

- 1) To award Social Colours to Daniel Monsell in recognition of his considerable dedication to the student community UCL.

2.2. Motion to Union Council on Fairtrade

Proposer: Joyce Ngai, Clinical Sciences III
Passed: Union Council, 21st May 2007
Lapses: Spring 2009

The Union notes:

- 1) Its policy supporting Fairtrade product availability in Union outlets;
- 2) That Fairtrade hot beverages are being sold across campus;
- 3) That many universities and many businesses across the UK have adopted a Fairtrade policy and have achieved Fairtrade status;
- 4) That to receive Fairtrade status five goals must be met:
 - a) The Student Union and the university authorities both create a Fairtrade policy incorporating these five goals.
 - b) Fairtrade foods are made available for sale in all campus shops. Fairtrade foods are used in all cafés/restaurants/bars on campus. Where this is not possible, there is a commitment to begin to use Fairtrade foods in these establishments as soon as it becomes possible to do so.
 - c) Fairtrade foods (for example, coffee and tea) are served at all meetings hosted by the university and the SU, and are served in all university and SU management offices.
 - d) There is a commitment to campaign for increased Fairtrade consumption on campus.
 - e) Set up a Fairtrade Steering Group

The Union further notes:

- 1) That UCL Union cannot achieve Fairtrade status independent of the university.

The Union believes:

- 1) That in the absence of alternatives, Fairtrade products currently provide the best means for producers to receive a reasonable price with which to improve their lives;
- 2) That students should be given a choice in the way they spend their money;
- 3) That the efforts of UCL Union and the university in regards to Fairtrade should be recognized.

The Union resolves:

- 1) To set up a Fairtrade Steering Group that includes a member of the Union executive and a representative of the university in its membership;
- 2) To commit to stocking Fairtrade alternatives in all Union outlets including shops, cafes and bars;
- 3) To serve Fairtrade food in all catered Union meetings and events, and all Union offices;
- 4) To continue to actively promote Fairtrade products, and support the annual Fairtrade Fortnight;
- 5) To put this motion to the university, substituting College for Union in clauses 2 and 3 of 'Union resolves'.

2.3. Motion to Union Council on Recycling

Proposer: Joyce Ngai, Clinical Sciences III
Passed: Union Council, 21st May 2007
Lapses: Spring 2009

The Union notes:

- 1) its policy on climate change lapsing in Summer 2007;
- 2) its strategic plan for 2007/08;
- 3) the lack of recycling facilities and the use of non-recyclable material in Union outlets;
- 4) that the UK produces more than 454 million tonnes of waste every year, and at least half of which could be recycled, but at the moment only 12% is recycled or composted [source: http://www.recyclezone.org.uk/iz_wastefacts.aspx];
- 5) that paper and card are the main ingredients of household rubbish, making up approximately one third of the waste produced by Britain's homes;
- 6) that many of the countries represented by international students at UCL, for example Denmark, Switzerland and Japan, have better records of recycling.

The Union further notes:

- 1) that a large amount of waste produced by students and staff could be recycled if proper facility existed;
- 2) that procedures could be put in place to reduce waste production;
- 3) that student unions such as that of Goldsmiths, University of London, have adopted an environmental policy giving details of its practices;
- 4) that previous installation of recycling facilities at UCL Union has not been a success because of inappropriate use;
- 5) that the Union buys its supplies in bulk;
- 6) that recyclable alternatives exist which are financially viable.

The Union believes:

- 1) that it is the duty of the management to provide ways to ensure waste is reduced, reused, or recycled as appropriate;
- 2) that with the recent interest in green issues and climate change, this is an issue that UCL, as a global institution, should lead in its response;
- 3) that provision should be made for those who wish to act responsibly towards the environment to be able to do so.

The Union resolves:

- 1) to investigate and source environmental-friendly alternatives for all aspects of its operation where possible;
- 2) to install recycling facilities for paper, glass, plastics and cans;
- 3) to ensure that its offices, bars, cafes and shops recycle their waste;
- 4) to encourage staff to reduce waste production, especially in regards to paper and disposable cups;
- 5) to educate students regarding the proper usage of recycling facilities;
- 6) to compile an annual document detailing the steps it has taken to achieve the above goals;
- 7) to lobby the College to improve its recycling and environmental practices.

2.4. Motion to Union Council to adopt the use of the UCL Union Disciplinary Guidance

Proposer: Zoë Davies, French Affiliate
Passed: Union Council, 21st May 2007
Lapses: Spring 2009

This Union Notes:

- 1) The need for guidance for clarification at disciplinary panels.

This Union Believes:

- 1) The responsibilities of staff and officers need to be clear to them and to members.
- 2) Our members should be able to understand the process and the possible penalties.
- 3) Consistency of penalty across union areas should be ensured i.e. verbal abuse is treated the same in the bars as on the sports field.
- 4) Appropriate records of incidents should be kept.
- 5) In compliance with the Constitution.

This Union Resolves:

- 1) To adopt the use of the Disciplinary Guidance for the forthcoming academic year.

Appendix 1: UCL Union Disciplinary Guidance

The information below is intended as guidance to supplement, but not replace section 14 of the UCL Union Standing Orders.

Initiating the process

The disciplinary investigation process is most commonly initiated by:

- a request by a member, following receipt of a complaint as per section 13 of the standing orders;
 - a report by a member of staff following receipt of an accident/incident form relating to activity whilst representing the Union, behaviour on campus or an incident in licensed premises; or
 - a referral from a Union committee such as Elections committee or Activities board
-

Remit

The Union reserves the right to initiate its own disciplinary procedures separately from any action taken by the College, Police or Sports National Governing Bodies.

Nothing in UCL Union's Disciplinary Procedure or supplementary guidance shall prevent the Licensee from exercising such powers as are available in relation to the preservation of good order under the various Licensing Acts. The Licensee may delegate his / her powers under these Acts to Duty Managers.

Reporting for investigation

• Clubs and Societies

It is the club presidents' responsibility to inform the Sports and Societies Administrator of

- all red card offences;
- serious breaches of discipline as determined by the referee; or
- incidents off pitch

Using the accident/incident form.

It is the responsibility of the society presidents to report all incidents on an accident/incident form to the Clubs & Societies Centre that occur during societies' events or whilst representing UCL Union.

All forms must be submitted to the Clubs & Societies Centre within two working days of the incident taking place. All incidents involving injury, the emergency services, college security or another institution's security team must be reported within one working day. Failure to report an incident may result in disciplinary action being taken against the club or society.

Where an incident involves loss, theft, damage or injury, a member may be required to complete additional forms for health & safety or insurance purposes.

On receipt of an accident/incident form the Sports & Societies Administrator and/or the Sports & Recreation Manager will decide whether:

- The incident should be referred to the General Manager for investigation as per section 14 of the Standing Orders.
- A temporary suspension from club/society activities should be applied to the member and/or club/society pending disciplinary investigation
- No further action is necessary.

The Clubs, Societies & Student Development Officer will be notified of all suspensions and disciplinary referrals related to student activities.

▪ **Licensed Premises**

The licensee or their delegates can impose temporary bans on access to the Union's licensed premises and in certain circumstances access to Union property pending a hearing under the UCL Union Disciplinary Procedure.

All incidents will be reported on an incident/accident report form within one working day.

The member of staff with delegated licensee responsibility will decide whether:

- The incident should be referred to the General Manager for investigation as per section 14 of the Standing Orders.
- A temporary suspension from licensed premises should be applied to the member(s).
- No further action is necessary.

The Services & Events Officer will be notified of all suspensions and disciplinary referrals related to licensed premises.

The Finance & Administration Officer will be notified of all suspensions and disciplinary referrals related to areas other than clubs and societies activity or licensed premises.

Appeals against suspension pending disciplinary investigation

Any student wishing to appeal against a staff imposed temporary suspension should do so in writing to the relevant Sabbatical officer i.e.

- Student activities related to suspensions: Clubs Societies & Student Development Officer
- Licensed premise related: Services & Events Officer
- Other: Finance & Administration Officer

The relevant sabbatical officer will then review the grounds of the suspension.

Criteria for referral for disciplinary investigation

Examples of behaviours that will be referred to the General Manager as potentially 'subject to disciplinary action' include:

- Actions likely to damage the Union's reputation or good standing.
- Significant breach(es) of Union rules or policy, including the equal opportunities policy.
- Verbally or physically threatening or abusive behaviour.
- Potentially illegal activity e.g. theft, financial fraud, possession of illegal substances, assault.

This list is not exhaustive.

Penalties

As per part 1 of section 14 of the Standing Orders, disciplinary hearings are normally heard under the Summary Disciplinary Procedures. Serious offences can be considered under the Disciplinary Panel Procedure.

When hearing the case under either procedure, the relevant Disciplinary Panel will consider:

1. Innocence or guilt
2. If guilty; the severity of the offence (see table A below)
3. Any mitigation
4. The appropriate penalty for the offence taking into account 2 & 3 above (see Table B as a guide below)

Each case will be considered on its merits, including any relevant mitigation. The Union strives to be consistent in its treatment of its members and will record and review decisions annually. The penalty spectrum below is only intended as a guide and will not limit the discretion of the disciplinary panel.

Table A: Levels of Offence

Level	Example offence
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General Misbehaviour ▪ Minor breaches of Union rules, standing orders or policy
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bringing the Union into disrepute
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intimidating or threatening behaviour ▪ Damage to property ▪ Violent conduct when taking part in competitive activity
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Failure to comply with a Union disciplinary penalty or process. ▪ Serious physical violence ▪ Verbal abuse of a discriminatory nature ▪ Illegal activity ▪ Significant breach of Union rules, standing orders or policy

Table B

Example penalties	
Individuals	Clubs / Societies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Formal reprimand ▪ Requirement to send an apology ▪ Requirement for compensation to be paid to make good any loss or damage arising from the offence ▪ Community service ▪ Imposition of a fine ▪ Suspension from clubs/societies events ▪ Exclude the member from any, or all, premises, services or activities of the Union for such a period as deemed appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suspension of room bookings ▪ Suspension of use of / access to UCL Union facilities ▪ Fine from account ▪ Removal from BUSA and / or London Leagues ▪ Temporary or permanent grant suspension ▪ Disaffiliation ▪ Any other reasonable penalty as determined by the Disciplinary Panel.

<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Restriction of the right to vote or stand in Union elections▪ Life time ban▪ Any other reasonable penalty as determined by the Disciplinary Panel.	
--	--

Additionally, where a disciplinary relates to the conduct of an elected member of the union, the executive may bring a separate motion of censure (Standing Orders section 8v) and/or no confidence (Standing Orders section 8ii and iv).

UCL Union reserves the right to refer cases to College for disciplinary action.

Appeals

All members have the right of appeal against the decision of a disciplinary panel. These are outlined in part 5 of section 14 of the Standing Orders. All appeals must be submitted within two weeks of receiving the written decision.

Reporting

All records of the disciplinary are confidential (14.ii.8). A brief summary of all cases heard under the Summary Procedure will be reported to the Union Executive. The decisions of cases heard under the Disciplinary Panel procedure will be reported to the next available meeting of the Union Executive (14.iii.K).

Confidentiality

The names of those subject to disciplinary action will not be included in the reporting of disciplinary cases, except where related to an elected member of the Union.

Monitoring

All accident/incident forms regardless of whether they result in disciplinary action will be stored in the UCL Union Administration Department and entered onto an incident database.

From 2007/08 a database of disciplinary cases will be maintained. An up to date report from this database detailing the nature of the offence, any mitigation and the penalty accorded will be provided to each disciplinary panel to act as an indication of past decisions. This is

only intended as a guide and will not limit the discretion of the disciplinary panel.

2.5. Motion to UCL Union on Climate Change

Proposer: Dominic Tarn, History II
Renewed: Union Council, 21st May 2007
Lapses: Spring 2009

This Union notes:

- 1) That the 20th century was the hottest century for a millennium and the 1990s its hottest decade. The level of Carbon Dioxide in the atmosphere is up one third on that of pre-industrial times: a level higher than it has been for at least 400, 000 years.
- 2) That the evidence that human activity is changing the climate is now overwhelming. The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicts that future greenhouse gas emissions are likely to increase average global temperatures by between 2.0 C and 6.1 C this century.
- 3) That continued global warming threatens to undermine or even reverse human progress as flooding, drought, disease and ecological disruption increasingly affects the world's population. Ultimately 'run-away' climate change threatens a global catastrophe of almost unimaginable scale.
- 4) That UCL Union currently lacks a comprehensive Environmental Policy and as such is contributing to the problem.
- 5) That implementing efficiency measures can result in long-term economic benefits.

This Union believes:

- 1) That there is an urgent need to reduce emissions of the greenhouse gases that cause climate change: especially CO₂, by replacing fossil fuels with alternative, renewable forms of energy.
- 2) To this end there is an urgent need for a new international emissions reductions treaty that will reduce total global emissions to a level that will not dangerously destabilise global climate.
- 3) That the UK government needs to do more to cut national emissions of greenhouse gases.
- 4) That as far as is economic the Union should operate in an environmentally friendly and sustainable manner.
- 5) That as an education institution and a global university UCL has an obligation to educate its students about climate change and to improve its environmental performance.

This Union resolves:

- 1) To run a campaign educating students about climate change and encouraging them to be more environmentally friendly.
- 2) To work towards making UCL Union more environmentally friendly and to lobby the College to do likewise. Specifically this should include:
 - a) Increasing recycling facilities
 - b) Improving efficiency and decreasing waste and use of resources such as paper
 - c) Looking into purchasing recycled materials such as paper
 - d) Looking into switching to renewable energy
 - e) Conducting a comprehensive environmental review to investigate environmental impacts and publishing a comprehensive environmental policy to provide a formal demonstration of intent.

2.6. Renewing Lapsing Policy on FAIRTRADE

Proposer: Tom Yates, Medicine IV
Renewed: Union Council, 21st May 2007
Lapses: Spring 2009

This Union notes:

- 1) that a large amount of coffee, tea, chocolate and wine are consumed by UCL students every day;
- 2) that trade liberalisation, enforced by the World Trade Organisation, makes it increasingly difficult for small traders to compete when multinational companies are able to benefit from subsidies and protections denied to small economies;
- 3) that Britain has many such subsidies including the Common Agricultural Policy which costs the tax payer £3.9bn per year
- 4) that this is impeding the progress of many less economically developed nations and reinforcing global inequalities;
- 5) that we are in the middle of Fairtrade Fortnight;
- 6) that a wide range of Fairtrade products are on the market including coffee, tea, cocoa, chocolate, snacks and biscuits, wine, fruit juice and fresh fruit;
- 7) that a Fairtrade mark guarantees, among other things, that the producer has been paid a price that covers the cost of production plus an additional social premium for development purposes',
- 8) the Fairtrade Foundation's annual report 2000-2001 estimates that 4.5 million producers and their families are now benefiting by selling on Fairtrade terms at an estimated £14 million more than they would have received on the conventional market;
- 9) that full details of the Fairtrade movements can be found at www.maketradefair.com;
- 10) that products with the Fairtrade mark are commercially successful with sales for 2003 46% up on 2002;
- 11) that some union outlets have begun to sell Fairtrade products;
- 12) that to become a Fairtrade University, as defined by the Fairtrade Foundation (see http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what_we_do/fairtrade/uniguide/5goals.htm for details), five goals must be met :
 - a) The university and student union must adopt a fair trade policy
 - b) Where possible, a fair trade alternative should be available for all products sold in outlets on campus
 - c) Fair Trade foods (for example, coffee and tea) should be served at all meetings hosted by the university and the SU, and in all university and SU management offices
 - d) There should be a commitment to campaign for increased Fair Trade consumption on campus
 - e) There should be a Fair Trade steering group that meets at least one a term to reflect on progress and decide how to go about continuing to excel in these goals.
- 13) that the RUMS Medsin society is working to make UCL a Fairtrade University.

This Union believes:

- 1) that trade liberalisation, enforced by the World Trade Organisation, is damaging developing countries;
- 2) that the protectionism of rich nations, including Britain, is indefensible;
- 3) that Fairtrade enables impoverished producers to support themselves and better their communities;
- 4) that the Fairtrade movement should be supported;
- 5) that it would be brilliant if UCL were a Fairtrade university;
- 6) that the RUMS Medsin society campaign should be welcomed;

This Union resolves:

- 1) where possible, to stock Fairtrade alternatives to all product lines in all outlets;
- 2) to heavily promote its Fairtrade products and put them in a prominent position within outlets;
- 3) to work with the RUMS Medsin Society towards UCL becoming a Fairtrade university.

2.7. Renewing Policy on Nestlé Boycott

Proposer: Tom Yates, Medicine IV
Renewed: Union Council, 21st May 2007
Lapses: Spring 2009

This Union notes:

- 1) Its policy on boycotting Nestlé (lapsed Autumn 2005).
- 2) That Nestlé continues to fail to unilaterally stop their aggressive marketing of Baby milk products in the Third World.
- 3) That over 80 student Unions in the UK are boycotting Nestlé.

This Union Believes:

- 1) That the Union should continue to endorse a Nestlé boycott as Nestlé's behaviour has not changed sufficiently since the previous boycott was endorsed.

This Union Resolves:

- 1) To continue to boycott Nestlé products, and to reject any offers of sponsorship or any association whatsoever with Nestlé.
- 2) To raise awareness of the reasons for the boycott amongst students and staff at the University.
- 3) To lobby the College and other relevant bodies (such as Scolarest) to remove all Nestlé products from the whole of the UCL campus.

2.8. Motion Regarding UCL Union Fundraising Policy

Proposer: Robbie Swale, Mathematics Affiliate
Passed: Union Council, 4th June 2007
Lapses: Spring 2009

This Union notes:

- 1) UCL Union has exempt charitable status.
- 2) That students undertake a wide range of activities as part of UCL Union, through clubs and societies, the VSU, and through the Union's central administration.
- 3) That amongst the activities which are performed UCL Union members fundraise for other charities.
- 4) That as a charity, UCL Union has significant regulations regarding the ways money can be given to other charities.
- 5) That there are a wide range of regulations from the Metropolitan Police and the Charity Commission regarding collecting money off-campus and street collections.
- 6) UCL Union's Club and Society Regulations.

This Union believes:

- 1) That it is an admirable activity for students to raise money for charities.
- 2) That UCL Union and Union Council have a responsibility to ensure that all rules and regulations with regards to charity collections are followed.

This Union resolves:

- 1) To adopt the attached procedures with regards to fund raising.

Appendix A: UCL Union Fundraising Policy

UCL Union is aware that as well as raising funds for their own activities, a number of clubs and societies and elected officers fundraise for external charities via collections, auctions, raffles or benefit events. UCL Union welcomes its members engaging with the wider community, but is keen to ensure that all involved are aware that charity collections are regulated by law. UCL Union now requires that all clubs, societies and members of Union Council wishing to fundraise on behalf of their own group or an external charity **must** have their request to fundraise form approved by Finance Sub-Committee before the event takes place. The fundraise form asks you to sign to confirm that you read, understood and agreed to abide by:

- The relevant Charity Commission legal requirements for charity collections
- The Metropolitan Police's licensing requirements for street collections

- UCL Union's Clubs & Societies regulations (where relevant) money handling procedures

It also outlines what information you need to give us about the charity that you are fundraising for to enable us to make the payment.

Appendix B: UCL Union Fundraising Rules

All fundraisers must comply with Charity Commission requirements including:

- All publicity related to fundraising events must clearly show who you are collecting for and, if they are registered charity, their charity number.
- You need to seek the permission of the beneficiary charity before using their name and it is essential that they approve copies of any fund-raising literature.
- Separate financial records should be kept.
- Collectors should be aware that under section 63 of the [Charities Act 1992](#) a person may be found guilty of an offence where they falsely state that an institution for which they are raising money is a registered charity unless they have reasonable grounds for believing that the institution was registered.

All fundraisers must comply with all UCL Union financial and clubs and societies regulations, including:

- Collection boxes and seals are available from UCL Union's cashier's counter. If you have your own boxes or buckets these must also be stored at the UCL Union cashiers office and signed in and out for each event.
- Fundraising expenses should be kept to a minimum.
- You must submit a piece of letter-headed paper showing the charities' registration number with the fundraise form. UCL Union reserves the right to request additional information for organisations not registered in the UK.
- All boxes and buckets must be returned to the UCL Union Cashiers office for counting and banking within 2 working days of the funds being collected.
- If you are organising a Fundraising event, an out-turn budget must be submitted to the CSC reception by the date set by Finance Sub-Committee for your event.
- A list showing the names of the collectors and which box or buckets they were collecting with must be submitted with the returned collection boxes to the Cashiers Office.
- If the collection is cancelled, the organiser must inform the Finance & Administration Officer in writing: fa.officer@ucl.ac.uk

Additional rules for Collecting Off-campus

If you are collecting money anywhere other than private property¹ then your collection will be covered by the Metropolitan Police regulations² for Street Collections. This means that:

- A street license must be applied for from the Charities Office of the Metropolitan Police by the first day of the month before the collection is due to take place.
- The Finance Manager of the Union must be named chief promoter.

¹ Private Property includes London Underground, The University and shops provided that the collection takes place wholly inside these premises (not on the threshold) e.g. not standing in the entrance to a tube station/Supermarket.

² If you are collecting outside of the Metropolitan Police area, you **must** seek advice from the local police authority.

- Expenses should be kept to a minimum. A maximum of 10% of the total collection is permissible for the first time collection; subsequent collections should be well below this.
- If the collections raises more than £400 an article must be published in a newspaper that is available to the general public (please contact the Clubs & Societies Centre for further information). This article must show the area in which the collection took place, the amount collected and any expenses incurred.
- Within 3 months of the collection, accounts should be submitted to the Charities Office showing the amount collected and any expenses or payment incurred. This should be signed by two of the persons responsible for the collection, and the Union Finance Manager.
- A list showing the names of the collectors and amounts collected in each box should also be submitted to the Charities Office (address below) together with the accounts.
- If the collection is cancelled, the Charities Office as well as the Finance Subcommittee must be told in writing. Write to: Charities, TP HQ, Room 443, Victoria Embankment, Westminster, London SW1A 2JL. Telephone: 0207-321-7129 and contact fa.officer@ucl.ac.uk

GUIDELINES FOR STREET COLLECTIONS WITHIN THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DISTRICT

- 1) No collector shall be under 16 years of age, unless the collection is in connection with a procession, then collectors may be under 16 years of age, but not less than 14, as long as they are accompanied by a responsible adult.
- 2) Collectors should be stationary except when the collection is accompanied by a procession.
- 3) Collectors should stand at least 25 metres apart.
- 4) Collectors should not cause danger, obstruction, inconvenience or annoyance to any person.
- 5) All collection boxes/buckets should display the name of the charity or fund collecting and should be securely sealed.
- 6) No animal should accompany collections.
- 7) Collectors should carry a written authority or badge signed on behalf of the Chief Promoter.
- 8) Collectors should probably be discouraged from hiring "fancy dress" etc. as the cost would almost certainly exceed the 10% expenses allowed for a collection.
- 9) No payment should be made to collectors.
- 10) A sample badge or letter of authority should be submitted to the Charities office before the collection takes place.

For more information on the above please see:

<http://www.charity-commission.gov.uk/publications/cc20.asp>

<http://www.met.police.uk/charities/streetcollection.htm>

Clubs & Societies 'Money Matters handbook'

2.9. Motion Against Non-Affiliation of 'Banking & Finance Networking Society'

Proposer: Oluwaseun Olushanu, Economics I
Passed: Union Council, 4th June 2007
Lapses: Spring 2009

This Union notes:

- 1) Our Society was rejected from affiliation twice by the union.

Both times they cited that our proposed society did not meet the following criteria I quote **'the activities must not be catered for by an existing club or society'** and **'the society must provide new opportunities and activities'**.

(I have both rejection the messages Appendix 1.)

- 2) Our club was set up to bring about change in the ever widening gap of ethnic minorities and non-ethnic minorities getting into mainly Banking, Consultancy and Law roles, through networking. We are called banking and finance as this is our main focus currently due to constraints. (This was explained to the Board). The club is non-exclusive.

The above however is the initial path we wish to follow we want to use this as a springboard in tackling the inherent problems pertaining to Black and Minority Ethnic underachievement in society. So career mentoring and networking is only a small section of it. In saying we want to close the 'ever widening gap' we mean we wish to tackle the issues, which may not be seen on the surface i.e. communication, soft skills, cultural differences, appearance etc.

The below explains what we have done at UCL prior to the application for affiliation:

- 3) We have held a highly successful networking event with over 15 ethnic investment bankers and one individual from consultancy. Over 100 undergraduates were in attendance at UCL. This event cost the members of the society over £150 to hold. Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, Deutsche Bank, JP Morgan, Deloitte, BNP Paribas, Merrill Lynch Credit Suisse Lehman Brothers all brought ethnic minority representatives to our networking event.
- 4) We have organised an educational event with a Banker from Credit Suisse so far 191 people have signed up raising over £1000 for his registered charity- I can confirm this for you if necessary it will be taking place Saturday 2nd June 07 at UCL.
- 5) In addition to this we have received confirmation from Tim Campbell a black professional who won the TV show 'Apprentice' that he will be interested in speaking at one of our events to empower ethnic minorities.
- 6) We have also received confirmation from the Organiser of Target Chances- an organisation that helps ethnic minorities into investment banking, that she will be speaking at our events www.targetchances.co.uk

- 7) Raphael Mokades the Managing Director of Rare Recruitment, which helps ethnic minorities get into a range of careers, has also agreed to attend our events for empowering. www.rarerecruitment.co.uk
- 8) All the above can be confirmed and email address or tel no.'s of the Banks that attended can be supplied on request. Anne Usher of UCL Economics Dept can confirm that both events in 3) and 4) took place.

Initial Rejection

- 9) I spoke to Robbie Swale and was informed that one of the main reasons for our non-affiliation was because of the overlap with the Economics and Finance Society (EFS). Robbie suggested I approach the EFS & The Widening Participation group to ask about the practicalities of organising events through them. **(Included in the Appendix 1)**
- 10) I spoke to the Dasha the president of EFS and Derek of the Widening Participation society they both informed me they believed that our planned activities don't currently fit into their framework. The EFS president also categorically stated that they have recognised that our objectives are completely different and for this reason wouldn't be able to facilitate our activities.

(I have attached their replies Appendix 2.)

This Union believes:

- 1) No UCL society or initiative currently provides for Black and Ethnic Minority Students in the way I have set out to. I have been at this university for 1 year now and have not had the opportunity to receive assistance in meeting my specific needs as a black individual trying to get into careers such as Law, Banking & Consultancy which continually see under representation in ethnic minority getting into such roles. For this reason I believe that there is no overlap. Also we do provide new opportunities as the first event we held has proven. A small example of this is that the Head Recruiter at Goldman Sachs for UCL brought along with her one of the Heads of Diversity to network with the attendees something which hasn't been done before at UCL. Let alone the other activities on the night of which 80% has not been done at UCL before. And the activities we are currently planning (some of which are mentioned in 4-7 of 'The Union Notes') also testify to the fact that we do in fact bring new opportunities.
- 2) After the initial event I held I have had a flood of messages from people asking me questions and advice, which I haven't got the resources or time to give which further argues for stronger focus on the issues affecting BME students in the form of a society. These activities are not provided at UCL. This 'society' has been tried and tested as it were and it has been a major success.

(I have attached pictures and a summary of our event Appendix 3)

- 3) I believe it is more than just holding events, which EFS already do, but seeing ethnic students need the encouragement and advice of ethnic mentors who have made it into their desired field. Our society has aims and objectives, which go far, beyond scope of the EFS who have said they are not able to facilitate our activities due to this. Our events do provide new opportunities for students especially ethnic minorities to make those networks and break out of the cycle of failure that we are currently in.

- 4) I believe as a black individual that UCL Union have unfairly suggested that my needs and the needs of my community are not important enough to warrant the formation of a society. The office of national statistics will confirm this problem is a large one and the problem isn't fast improving. The Union, I feel, have failed to recognise that this is a major problem and just because on the surface it may seem that the club resembles ones already in existence doesn't mean that assumption is correct. They have failed to explain explicitly where I can get the assistance which according them is 'already provided' I would happily give up on this cause if I felt that in my second academic year I would receive assistance but it is simply not there.
- 5) I feel this as a major discouragement I have applied over 4 months ago and have been persistent and have rejected twice. I have used my own initiative, time and money to organise events because I felt that they were not currently provided at UCL but this has not even been acknowledged or appreciated in any way.
- 6) I feel very insulted as a black individual by the suggestion that we should be an add on to another society or initiative. I believe any form of or integration of societies or ideas would undermine and reduce the effect of our objectives i.e. in terms of having a committee with a strong focus on the issues facing BME students and in terms of the practicalities of holding events.
- 7) I feel very much that this is a 'race issue' not so much that the Union are racist but unfortunately and to some extent expectedly are out of touch with the needs of ethnic minorities. Now this may be because they are in general non-BME's themselves but I feel deeply disappointed that such a renowned institution as UCL in the current day are missing vital opportunities to assist those who are most oppressed and prone to failure in our society.
- 8) I have really put myself out on this issue to help my fellow BME students and I feel I'm being told that I'm not allowed to do help them. I refuse to roll over and keep my mouth shut on this issue there needs to be a change and now, quite frankly I'm disappointed UCL have not thought of such an initiative themselves.

This Union resolves:

- 1) To reverse the decision of non-affiliation.
- 2) To change the process of affiliation in rejecting without clear reason and without addressing the individual face-to-face especially if they appeal the decision
- 3) Ensure that the UCL Union properly considers the effects of decisions on particular ethnic communities within the University and seeks to counter any racial ignorance within their committee.

Note: Appendices 1, 2 and 3 are available from the DSU on request.

Summer 2009

3.1. Motion to Union Council to amend the climate change motion

Proposer: Craig Griffiths, German II
Passed: Union Council, 30th October 2007
Lapses: Summer 2009

This union notes:

1. that a motion to the Union council on climate change was renewed on 21.05.07
2. that a motion to the Union council on recycling was passed on 21.05.07
3. that climate change is a threat to the future of human civilization
4. that the effects of climate change are already being seen
5. that UCLU People & Planet is working towards making UCL a more environmentally responsible institution
6. that a London-wide Go Green week will be held in the week beginning February 18th 2008, and that this initiative has the support of the Mayor of London
7. that recyclable materials such as paper are widely available at no great cost

This union believes:

1. that students have an important role to play in combating climate change
2. that therefore the union has an important role to play in combating climate change
3. that the previous, renewed motion of 21.05.07 did not go far enough
4. that for the union to become more environmentally responsible would not result in any great financial loss
5. that it is not enough to make vague proposals or issue eco-friendly sound bites
6. that action to combat climate change is required immediately

This union resolves:

1. that the phrase "as far as economic" should be removed from the climate change motion - point four should therefore read "this union believes that the Union should operate in an environmentally friendly and sustainable way"
2. to support UCLU People & Planet's efforts to raise awareness about climate change and to encourage greater environmental responsibility from students

3. that a working group should be set up to develop a union environmental policy, the drafting of which should be considered a matter of urgency. Specifically this should mandate the union to:
 - a. increase recycling facilities (at least paper, cans, plastic bottles, glass & batteries) as early as possible
 - b. buy recyclable materials where they are available
 - c. implement recycling at and around future Freshers' Fayres
 - d. make a comprehensive review of the union's energy use and to consider the use of renewable energy
 - e. implement more eco-friendly alternatives to polystyrene cups at retail outlets
4. that the environmental policy will not only provide a formal demonstration of intent but also be fully binding upon staff and student members in the day-to-day running of the union
5. to lobby the College to continue developing its own environmental policy

3.2. Motion to Union Council: Motion on making UCLU events more inclusive

Proposer: Olivia Alford, SSEES affiliate
Passed: Union Council, 30th October 2007
Lapses: Summer 2009

This Union notes:

1. That a section of UCL Union members do not drink alcohol for religious/cultural/personal reasons.
2. That UCL Union is an equal opportunities organisation and no person that comes into contact with it should receive less favourable treatment.
3. That one of UCL Union's objects is to "promote social intercourse amongst members and throughout College."

This Union further notes:

1. That LSE SU are running a non-alcoholic freshers party for the first time this year.
2. That a students' union venue at Goldsmiths is being used as a showcase for students' art work rather than drinking during their Freshers' week. Their student union has also organised more daytime social gatherings this year.
3. That the sale of alcohol in student bars nationally is decreasing: a decade ago, student unions made £1.2m a year on alcohol sales; today, the figure is closer to £600,000.

This Union believes:

1. That at present, the majority of regular UCLU events take place in the Union bars and that this deters those who do not drink from attending.
2. That the UCLU events programme does not cater for those students who, for cultural/religious/personal reasons, are not able to drink or enter licensed venues.
3. That behaviour of students intoxicated by alcohol can alienate those who do not necessarily want to drink alcohol.

This Union resolves:

1. That UCL Union will provide events for those who do not drink in order for them to be more involved members of the Union.

This Union mandates:

1. the S&E Officer, with the P&E Officer to investigate the prospect of running regular non-alcoholic events throughout term in dry venues with the guidance of the Commercial Services and Events Manager. To report recommendations to first UCLU Council in the Spring term.
2. That a non-alcoholic event is organised for Freshers' week by UCLU.

3.3. Motion to accept Memorandum & Articles of Association and Draft Bye-Laws & Guidance Documents

Proposer: Primal Fernando, Physics Affiliate
Passed: Union Council, 30th October 2007
Lapses: Summer 2009

This Union Notes:

1. That changes in charity law will require UCL Union to register as a charity in its own right within the near future.
2. The motion of Union Council 26th February 2006 mandating the Finance & Administration Officer to investigate alternative governance systems ([Appendix 1](#)).
3. The subsequent consultation and research exercises carried out as part of the UCL Union Governance Review ([Appendix 2](#)).
4. The various meetings of Union Council, Executive and related Working Groups at which prospective new governance structures were discussed ([Appendix 3](#)).
5. The subsequent draft UCL Union Memorandum & Articles of Association, Bye-Laws and Guidance documents produced as a result (attached as Union Council Draft).
6. That the students who constructed these proposed drafts were democratically elected members of Union Council.

This Union Believes:

1. That UCL, UCLU and their students and members have changed in many ways since the current Constitution came into effect in 1999/2000.
2. That the current Standing Orders are out of date, cumbersome and restrictive.
3. That necessity to register as a charity in its own right has acted as springboard for the Union to review its governance as a whole.
4. That allowing for accessibility and openness is core to the Union's democratic activity.

This Union Resolves:

1. To accept the attached Union Council Draft "[Bye-Laws](#)" and "Guidance Documents"³ as the findings and suggestions of the Governance Review.
2. To accept the attached Union Council Draft "[Memorandum & Articles of Association](#)" as the findings and suggestions of the Governance Review.

³ [Appendix 1 Glossary Council](#), [Appendix 2 Union Council Guidance](#), [Appendix 3 Meetings Guidance](#), [Appendix 4 NUS Guidance Council](#), [Appendix 5 Part-time Guidance](#), [Appendix 6 Disciplinary Guidance](#), [Appendix 7 Committees Guidance](#), [Appendix 8 Forum Guidance Council](#), [Appendix 9 Elections Guidance Council](#).

3.4. Motion to UCL Union Council to Amend the Ethical investment Policy

Proposer: Sherina Peroos, Medicine II
Passed: Union Council, 20th November 2007
Lapses: Summer 2009

This union notes

1. that a motion to the Union council on Ethical Investment was passed on 26th February 2007 supporting the cross-society DisarmUCL campaign to lobby the University to divest its shares in Cobham plc and extend UCL's SRI policy to preclude investments in arms companies, and make a detailed public statement regarding their progress at the start of each term.
2. that UCL continues to invest in £884 000 in Cobham PLC (Jack Foster, Director of finance, September 2007).
3. that UCL Council agreed on 13th June 2007 that a working group of Council be established to consider the specific issue of investment in arms manufacturers and the more general issue of an ethical investments policy for UCL and that the working group be encouraged to report back to Council at the earliest opportunity.
4. that there has been no specific timescale for UCLs disinvestment in its shares in Cobham PLC.

This union believes

1. that continued investment of arms shares is damaging to UCL's global reputation and undermines its professed tradition of liberal values and social justice.
2. that there are many students and alumni of UCL who are committed to ethical investment and have suggestions, knowledge and expertise on this matter

This union resolves

1. to lobby UCL to disinvest from Cobham PLC before the end of the 2007 winter term, 14/12/2007.
 2. to call on UCL to give a formal role to students and alumni in the developmental process of an ethical investment policy at UCL.
- to call on UCL to establish this policy swiftly, with the process and timetable for designing and implementing it made clear and publicly available. This should include the setting out of the role of students, staff and alumni in the process

3.5. Hands Off Our Union: Motion to stop the undemocratic 'governance review'

Proposer: Jeremy Harris, English III, 40571221
Passed: Union Council, 29th November 2007
Lapses: Summer 2009

This Union Notes:

- 1) On 16th May, Media and Communications Officer 2006-2007, posted a series of pages on UCL Union's website entitled 'A Time 4 Change' promoting and advocating the 'Governance Review's proposed changes. These pages strongly implied that the Charities Act 2006 required some or all of these changes.
- 2) A "Governance Review" conducted by the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 sabbatical officers proposes to, among other things:
 - a) incorporate the union into a company controlled by a board of trustees rather than general meetings or elected council.
 - b) appoint non-student, unelected, "lay-trustees" to that board.
 - c) require that the board of trustees meet in private and exclude students from its meetings
 4. allow the board of trustees to overrule union council policies and interpret what motions are 'ultra vires'.
 - d) abolish the elected student executive.
 - e) name the Dean of Students the returning officer of the Union allowing the University administration rather than the Union or the NUS to oversee the running of elections.
- 3) That apart from registering with the Charities Commission, the Charities Act 2006 makes no new requirements on students unions and requires no changes to student union governance.
- 4) That UCL Union's Constitution, its sovereign document which takes precedence over the standing orders, makes no reference to the sabbatical officers as "trustees" nor does it grant them any powers collectively.
- 5) That Standing Orders are, unlike the Union's Constitution, internal union documents not regulated by any external body, which may be suspended at any time by Council or a General Meeting. When Standing Orders conflict with the Constitution they were improperly formed, and when Standing Orders can be interpreted to conflict with the Constitution that interpretation has no force.
- 6) That UCL Union's Constitution, Article VIII, Section A, states that "Union Council shall be the policy making body of the union and shall be responsible for the formulation of Union policy...Union Council shall exercise the powers and perform the duties of the Union, save those required to be exercised by a General Meeting or Referendum", and Article VIII, Section B. states that decisions made at Council override those made at Union Committees.

- 7) That UCL Union's Constitution, Article IX, Section A, states that decisions made at General Meetings shall override those made at Council or any Union Committee subject to the standing orders on General Meetings. Article IX, Section B, states that General Meetings may consider any matter apart from establishment (staffing) matters.
- 8) Both the Constitution and Standing Orders grant Council and General Meetings power over Sabbatical Officers. Both the Constitution and the Standing Orders contain an explicit power of Council to "override" Union Officers and the Executive, and for General Meetings to "override" Council, the Executive, and Union Officers. The Standing Orders further provide General Meetings and Council the explicit power to mandate individual sabbatical and executive officers, and the requirement to obey Council and General Meetings is stated explicitly in all Sabbatical Officer's contracts. Neither the Constitution nor the Standing Orders provide any provisions for Sabbatical Officers to "veto" Council or General Meetings decisions.
- 9) That the NUS Policy on "ultra vires", which is to say what is 'beyond the power' of a student union or one of its bodies, states that NUS Conference believes "...it has been known for student union officers to use ultra vires to wriggle out of mandates which they do not want to uphold and oppose policies which they do not like when there is no question of illegality whatsoever."

This Union Believes:

- 1) Were the new governance model as proposed by the 2006-2007 sabbatical officers to be implemented, UCL Union would no longer be run "by students for students", student democracy would no longer be in effective control and it would amount to a takeover of UCL Union by its managerial staff, professional outsiders, and College.
- 2) Authority should follow democratically from the student membership as a whole up to the representative bodies they elect to delegate to make policy between General Meetings and Elections, to the executives to which they delegate the ability to implement policy. The proposal for new governance promoted by the 2006-2007 sabbatical officers would implement the opposite structure, granting all authority to a small board of trustees at the top and allowing them to delegate their power down to student representatives and student meetings. This reversal of roles would reduce democratic accountability in the Union to the whims of a trustees board; students would no longer have the power to mandate officers but to merely make suggestions.
- 3) That the PDF document recently posted on the Union's website in the "Time 4 Change" 'Governance Review' pages statement on "Policy" claims that Council or General Meeting policy "should only be contravened on the instructions of the Trustees on an issue which threatens serious legal or financial dangers" and identifies the sabbatical officers as the Union's trustees, apparently based on two lines in the Standing Orders which do not appear in the Union's Constitution. This

claim clearly misleads students on the facts of the current union structure since sabbatical officers may not contravene union policy, and in doing so it makes it less evident what democratic rights the new proposed structure would deprive students of, namely the right to determine for themselves what is ultra vires so that this may not be used as an excuse to suppress political activity as it so often is.

- 4) That should it be a sabbatical officer's opinion that the Union's policy to be legally or financially dangerous they should either attempt to change that policy through the democratic means available to them, a General Meeting or Council, or they should resign, but they should not act unlawfully in assuming powers which they do not have under the Union's Constitution and to do so would be gross misconduct. To implicitly advise Sabbatical officers to act in such an unlawful manner is, at least, grossly irresponsible.

This Union Resolves:

- 1) To overturn the February 2006 Union Council resolution "Motion To Union Council – New Governance" proposed by Lucy Gould.
- 2) To decide not to invest ultimate legal authority over the Union in any body or group other than the Union General Meeting of all students, apart from a fully elected Union Council between General Meetings, when it is not contravened by a Union General Meeting, or the Executive during emergencies when Council cannot be convened, except when it contradicts Council or a General Meeting.
- 3) To decide not to grant "lay trustees" or other non-students power to veto democratic student decisions. This includes but is not limited to vetoing motions on the grounds of "ultra vires" or "financial interests", and decides that such power is reserved to the Union General Meeting and the union's elected bodies.
- 4) To decide not to have "lay trustees."
- 5) To decide not to incorporate as a company limited by guarantee, private company, or otherwise change the Union's legal status to one which students would not be able to run it through direct democratic means such as policy making Union General Meetings.
- 6) To decide not to exclude students from any policy making meeting or meeting that could exercise all of the powers of the Union, apart from in establishment (or staffing) matters as allowed by the Constitution.
- 7) To mandate the Union Executive to desist in attempting to implement any of the above changes either unilaterally, or through referendum, or any means other than Union General Meeting.
- 8) To mandate the executive to remove all references to the "governance review" or "a time 4 change" from the Union's website and to place a graphic link to sducl.co.uk on the union's front page of equal size and prominence to the "time 4 change" link.
- 9) To mandate the Education and Welfare Officer to produce an account of expenditure incurred in the pursuit of the Governance Review project since its inception to include costs incurred through legal advice, the

provision of consultants, advisors and any Union expenditure on human or material resources where their principal purpose has been to develop or promote the Governance Review's proposals, and to present this account of expenditure on the Union noticeboard at least one week in advance of the next meeting of Union Council.

- 10) To regard any attempt on the part of any Union Officer to subvert or defy UCL students' democratic control of the Union, including the power to mandate officers through the means allowed in the Constitution and Standing Orders, as gross misconduct.

Autumn 2009

4.1. Motion to Council Regarding Publicity for General Meetings

Proposer: Samantha Godwin, Philosophy
Passed: Union Council, 15th January 2008
Lapses: Autumn 2009

This Union Notes:

1. The Union has not had a general meeting that has met quorum for some time and although the WGM had a high turn out compared to last years, it did not meet quorum.
2. The standing orders require that the date of the WGM be publicized from the first day of term on the official notice board and elsewhere as appropriate. The date of the WGM was not publicized on time on the notice board.
3. There were extremely few posters around the Union building or its poster boards publicizing the WGM and apart from the small notice on the Union's official notice board on the website, no visibility on the website.
4. On the official union notice board on the Union's website, the links to the motions and the agenda were not displayed by their title before the WGM but instead given roman numerals and in some instances, titles made up by the F&A officer in reference to star trek films. This meant that, in order to actually see any information about the content of anything being debated at the WGM, a visitor to the website would have to follow at least three links (from the front page, to the student union section, to the union notice board, and finally to the numbered motions)
5. That the deadline for motion submissions to the WGM was not publicized anywhere on the website this year.
6. That the lack of publicity for the WGM was raised in two consecutive executive committee meetings before the WGM.

This Union Believes:

1. That many UCL students were unaware of the date, time, and location of the Welcome General Meeting and unaware of the motions being discussed.
2. That the Union could do much more to publicize general meetings than it has done in the past and that doing so would likely increase turnout.
3. That the Union website was underutilized in promoting the Welcome General Meeting.

This Union Resolves:

1. To give more publicity to future general meetings by having at least one poster in at least 1/4th of the Union's physical notice boards, including at least three in prominent locations in the Union's building on 25 Gordon Street, at least one of which must be in the 25 Gordon Street lobby area, for at least one week preceding each general meeting.
2. To list motions to general meetings and council on the official union notice board by their title.
3. To have a button link on the Union's front page advertising general meetings for at least one week in advance.
4. To have a text link to the Union's official notice board from the Union's front page.

4.2. Motion to support London Student

Proposer: Katherine Lay, French IV
Passed: Union Council, 15th January 2008
Lapses: Autumn 2009

This union notes

1. That London Student is the newspaper of the University of London Union, and is editorially independent of its publishers.
2. That London Student is the only independent source of news and information available to students at our campus.
3. That it is the only student paper that covers cross-college issues and allows students from the University of London's constituent colleges to communicate with each other.
4. That London Student is committed to providing training to future journalists,
 1. writers and photographers from many different degrees and backgrounds
 2. across the University of London.
5. That London Student has a paid full-time sabbatical editor.
6. That the editor's position has unanimous support from the paper's current
 3. editorial board.
7. That over 100 University of London students contribute to each edition of London Student.

This union believes

1. That it is the editor who ensures accuracy, consistency, variety and originality of content in London Student's reporting.
2. That the editor is able to dedicate time to training contributors and offering feedback.
3. That the editor provides a vital source of support to section editors when their degree commitments mean they cannot complete all of their duties on the paper.
4. That it is unreasonable to expect full-time students to provide the current level of feedback, support and training to other contributors.
5. That the quality of London Student would be severely compromised without a full-time editor.
6. That without the full-time editor the paper would probably fold.
7. That London Student is one of the main benefits of ULU membership to UCL students.

This union resolves

1. To mandate any UCL Union officer sitting on ULU Senate to vote to maintain the position of London Student editor, and to maintain the paper in its current form as a fortnightly newspaper.

4.3. Red Alert: Urgent Action Needed on Climate Change.

Proposer: Jo Casserly, ESPS
Passed: Union Council, 26 February 2008
Lapses: Autumn 2009

Red Alert: Urgent Action Needed on Climate Change

Union Notes:

1. The overwhelming scientific consensus that climate change is happening and is caused by the emission of green house gases chiefly through the burning of fossil fuels.
2. The Kyoto treaty is about to expire and its targets have, on the whole, been missed by signatory states. And that in Bali, at the UN Climate Conference, there was no agreement on binding targets for green house gases but only the promise to "keep talking".
3. That students at LSE have initiated a youth and students conference on climate change on March 8th called "Red Alert: Urgent Action Needed on Climate Change".
4. That the conference is being advertised at universities nationally, has a website (www.ClimateRedAlert.com) and is asking for sponsorship to cover publicity costs.
5. That the Campaign Against Climate Change organises an annual demonstration in London and recently held a successful conference for Trade Unionists attended by 200 people.

Union Believes:

6. That if left unchecked climate change will lead to a 21st century marked by a series of ecological and human catastrophes and that this will massively effect our generation and future generations.
7. That if this is to be averted then organising young people and students to campaign on this issue will be absolutely essential.

Union Resolves:

8. To sponsor the Red Alert Conference (cost £25) and list the UCL Union as a supporter of the conference.
- To continue to support the work of the Campaign Against Climate Change and for the Communication & Services Officer to encourage students to participate in its annual demonstration next autumn by producing publicity, by email and on the website.

4.4. Motion to Amend Annual Conference Motion 701

Proposer: Primal Fernando, Physics Affiliate 40425485
Passed: Union Council, 26 February 2008
Lapses: Autumn 2009

Motion to Amend Annual Conference Motion 701

This Union Notes:

1. That Motion 701 at annual conference has the following resolves:
1. For building for the 2009 review to be NUS' priority campaign, focussing on defeating any attempt to lift the cap, opposing the marketisation of education and campaigning for a fairer funding system for all students.
2. To campaign for a national bursary scheme.
2. That UCL had an overspend in the figures it gave as predicted and actual spend on Bursaries.
3. That UCL had the biggest overspend of all Russell Group Institutions.
4. That whilst there was an actual underspend in the amount of money that UCL actually allocated to Bursaries, this excess was put into an account, the interest from which goes into our hardship funds.
5. That hardship funds go to the same people who are eligible for bursaries.
6. In 2009, a review will take place of Higher Education Funding
7. That in 2008, all students at UCL with a family income of £60,000 will be eligible for a bursary from UCL.
8. That Imperial College, another Russell Institution with an overspend, has a motion, written by their President and Vice president Education and Welfare opposing National Bursaries.
9. That Part-time tuition fees are not in-line with full time.
10. That UCAS forms have changed the tick-box asking changing details being given to institutions from opt-in to opt-out.
11. That nearly 10,000 students took to the streets of London last year to say that the funding scheme as it stands is not great.
12. That the Bursary system is still new.
13. That nationally there was a lack of take up of Bursaries.
14. That nationally part-time fees and support is not in-line with full-time.

This Union Believes:

1. That Bursaries are good for students.
2. That in 2009 we should be lobbying for a fairer funding system.
3. That HE Funding affects our students
4. That even though we had an overspend, a national Bursary System will not help our students because the equivalent access offer may not be as good.
5. That in campaigns for National Bursary schemes, no mention of the rules and regulations for who will be eligible have been mentioned.
6. That a National Bursary System is a lazy way to sort out the HE Funding question and allows for students to be charged excess during their education.
7. That if a HEI has an overspend then a national bursary scheme may not be advantageous because the equivalent access offer may not be as good and if a HEI have an underspend, that their money will be taken away from them – neither of which is good for students.

8. That the opt-out box will help make more students eligible to receive a bursary.
9. That by having national bursaries certain HEIs may get out of their obligation to meet their duties in meeting Widening Participation targets.
10. That the current higher education funding system has put off some students from disadvantaged backgrounds from University.

This Union Resolves to:

1. Oppose a National Bursary Scheme.
2. To make the NUS lobby the government to hold OFFA and HEIs to account for their underspends.
3. To make the NUS lobby for part-time student fees to be brought in-line with full time.
4. To lobby for a fairer funding system
5. To amend motion 701 in accordance with above motion.

4.5. Emergency Motion on 'Occupied Palestinian Territories'

Proposer: Taherali Gulamhussein, Philosophy 3, 50232994
Passed: Annual General Meeting, Reconvened 5 March 2008
Lapses: Autumn 2009

Emergency Motion on "Occupied Palestinian Territories"

THIS UNION NOTES

1. That, almost four years ago, the United Nations (henceforth UN) International Court of Justice (henceforth ICJ), "principal judicial organ of the United Nations" reaffirmed that since 1967, the Government of Israel (henceforth GOI) has "Occupied Palestinian territory". Occupation is illegal, according to the ICJ, because "acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible".
2. That the UN term "Occupied Palestinian Territories" refers to Gaza and the West Bank including East Jerusalem (henceforth WB inc. EJ.) and is accepted by the European Union (EU) and British Government.

West Bank, including East Jerusalem

3. That the GOI has, and continues to occupy the WB inc. EJ physically in terms of Settlements. Settlements are those communities of Israeli citizens that have been constructed on Palestinian land held by GOI since 1967 which are illegal according to ICJ. Although GOI did remove settlements from North Samaria in the WB in 2002, since then settlement construction has recommenced. For example recently with regards Har Homa, a settlement in the West Bank, "contracts to build an additional 307 new homes were announced the same week that Israeli and Palestinian politicians met to begin final-status talks following [last] November's [i.e. 2007] Annapolis peace summit"
4. That the ICJ advised "that Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, are illegal and an obstacle to peace and to economic and social development as well as those demanding the complete cessation of settlement activities."
5. That the GOI is committed to retaining East Jerusalem, which is regarded as Occupied Palestinian Territory by ICJ, EU and UK Government as mentioned in note 2; Ron Prosor, Israeli Ambassador to the UK recently said there could be "no negotiation on fact of [Jerusalem] which is the heart of the state of Israel... for 3000 years... Jerusalem shall remain the capital of Israel forever"
6. That the ICJ affirmed furthermore "that actions taken by Israel, the occupying Power, to change the status and demographic composition of Occupied East Jerusalem have no legal validity and are null and void"
7. That Israel has, and continues to occupy the WB inc. EJ physically in terms of "...closures'... a policy of physical barriers and permit requirements used to control Palestinian pedestrian and vehicular movement" which include checkpoints, road gates, roadblocks, earth mounds, trenches, road barriers, earth walls, travel restrictions, property owning restrictions, movement restrictions ("settler only roads), ID cards etc.
Please refer to "Closures in the West Bank" and "Fragmentation of the West Bank" for further details

http://www.ochaopt.org/index.php?module=displaysection§ion_id=125&static=0&format=html

8. That furthermore Israel has occupied the WB inc. EJ physically in terms of “constructing a Barrier throughout the West Bank, which it states is a security measure to protect Israeli civilians from Palestinian militant attacks which... consists of 8-metre high concrete walls, ditches, trenches, wire fences, patrol roads and barbed wire.” Please refer to “West Bank Barrier” for further details

http://www.ochaopt.org/index.php?module=displaysection§ion_id=125&static=0&format=html

9. That the ICJ ruled “By fourteen votes to one , [that] The construction of the wall being built by Israel, the occupying Power, in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including in and around East Jerusalem... are contrary to international law” and that it “is in departure from the Armistice Line of 1949 (Green Line)”... which has involved the confiscation and destruction of Palestinian land and resources, the disruption of the lives of thousands of protected civilians and the de facto annexation of large areas of territory of internationally recognised Palestinian land.”

10. That furthermore the ICJ ruled “By fourteen votes to one , [that] Israel... is under an obligation to cease forthwith the works of construction of the wall being built in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including in and around East Jerusalem, to dismantle forthwith the structure therein situated”

11. That the ICJ also ruled “By thirteen votes to two... [that] all States parties [i.e. United Kingdom Government] to the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949 have in addition the obligation... to ensure compliance by Israel with international humanitarian law as embodied in that Convention”

12. That the ICJ also ruled that “Israel is accordingly under an obligation to return the land, orchards, olive groves and other immovable property seized from any natural or legal person for purposes of construction of the wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory.”

13. That the Israeli Supreme Court (henceforth ISC), ruled on 30th June 2004 on a petition submitted in February 2004 by residents against the West Bank Barrier and commented that [the wall]“injures the local inhabitants in a severe and acute way, while violating their rights under humanitarian international law”

14. That furthermore the ISC ruled in 2005 that “Based on the factual infrastructure presented to us, the existing route of the separation fence raises questions (...) We were completely unconvinced that there is a decisive military-security reason for placing the route of the fence where it currently runs (...)”

15. That the ICJ advised it was “Gravely concerned also at [1] the even more devastating impact of the projected parts of the wall on the Palestinian civilian population and [2] on the prospects for solving the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and establishing peace in the region”

16. That the GOI, in violation of the 2005 Agreement on Movement and Access, has made all major roads (with a total length of 700 km) basically off-limits to Palestinians.

17. That according to the UN OCHA OPT, “The West Bank has limited natural resources and its economy depends on trade and remittances from jobs in Israel. Since the majority of the West Bank’s trade is with Israel, the current closure regime is forcing many West Bankers into reliance on aid and worsening the already deteriorating socio-economic conditions.”

Gaza

18. That, according to the UN OCHA OPT, Gaza is currently a “humanitarian situation”

19. That "On 18 January, following a surge in conflict between the IDF and armed Palestinians, Israel closed all crossings from Israel into Gaza, cutting it off from all supplies of food, medicine and fuel including humanitarian aid." and since then "... a total of 32 truckloads of goods have entered the Gaza Strip from Israel. Prior to June 2007, 250 truckloads a day entered Gaza"; "Erez crossing remained open for Palestinians needing urgent medical treatment and international humanitarian workers. On 22 January, restricted fuel deliveries resumed and limited humanitarian goods were allowed in. Since 18 January, no commercial goods have been allowed into Gaza. On 23 January, Palestinians destroyed the border wall that separates Gaza and Egypt, allowing thousands of Palestinians to cross in and out of Egypt since then."

20. That on Sunday 3rd February, the border wall with Egypt was re-closed and once again 1.5 million Gazans "rely on Israel for all their supplies" and desperately insofar as "over three-quarters of the current estimated population... are registered refugees"

21. That Gazans rely on Israel for all their supplies because there is no freedom of movement between Gaza and the West Bank, and only extremely limited access to Israel. This is a long-standing issue insofar as since 1994, there has been a border fence between Gaza and Israel which restricts access.

22. That "The World Food Programme is unable to give a full ration of food to 84,000 of their poorest beneficiaries because of the closure"

23. That all goods crossings between Gaza and Israel i.e. "The Karni conveyor belt, Sufa and Kerem Shalom goods crossings have been completely closed since 27 January. The Nahal Oz pipelines for fuel have been open since 22 January"

24. That "Israel is allowing a restricted amount of fuel to enter Gaza but only enough to ensure 75 per cent of Gaza's electricity needs are met which does not allow for the proper function of public services"

25. That "Due to limited reserves of fuel, the Gaza power plant has reduced its power output to 45 megawatts, causing power cuts of up to eight hours per day everywhere in Gaza except Rafah"

26. That "Gaza's waste water system is only partially functioning, leading to the daily dumping of 40 million litres of untreated sewage into the Mediterranean sea"

27. That "Around 50 per cent of Gazan households have access to running water for only four to six hours"

28. That, according to Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) "Everyone has the right to education", and that according to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966),¹³ "Education is both a human right in itself and an indispensable means of realizing other human rights."

29. That there is no This Union Believes section in this motion.

30. That the ICJ refers to the part of what the Israeli government calls "The Security Fence", that passes through the West Bank as "the wall", and that all aforementioned references to "the wall" were in the context of quotes by the ICJ

31. That the Israeli Supreme Court has referred to what the Israeli Government calls "The Security Fence" as "a separation fence"

32. That the latest report from the UN OCHA OPT on 4th March 2008 said the following re. the recent "escalation in violence" by the IDF in the Gaza strip:

"Between 27 February and 2 March, 107 Palestinians were killed by the IDF and 250 were injured. During the same period two Israeli soldiers and one Israeli civilian were killed and 25 injured, mainly by Qassam rockets and Grad missiles fired by Palestinian militants towards Israel..."

Education: Schools in and around areas of military operations in northern Gaza remained closed between 1-3 March. The attendance rate of UNRWA schools in Gaza City was about 20% and in other areas of the Gaza Strip between 40% and

65%. On the evening of 2 March homework session at the New Gaza Preparatory School was disrupted when an Israeli helicopter fired into the school yard.”

33. That this amendment and the original motion have only sourced organisations recognised by both the International community at large (including the British Government) and Israeli Government.

34. That the UCLU Friends of Palestine has been under unprecedented recent attacks particularly with respect to a recent exhibition. i) Physical damage was caused to the exhibition by those that disapproved of it, which is being investigated by UCL Union ii) slander was performed by the UCL Union Media & Communications Officer insofar as he said “I have looked at some of the pictures and to be honest they are inciting racial hatred... and we would appreciate it as a gesture of good will if they were taken down” which culminated in false claims made to the Jerusalem Post .

35. That this exhibition was funded and produced by Jewish Israelis from The Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions, as well as actively promoted and funded by the Austrian Government Development Fund and the Netherlands Government Development Fund to name a few.

THIS UNION RESOLVES

36. To commit to find out what it is like to live as a student in the oPt by asking students from the oPt for ourselves.

37. To accordingly twin UCLUnion with Al-Quds University and Al-Azhar University student unions with immediate effect.

38. To twin with the universities in the oPt, Al-Quds in the West Bank and Al-Azhar secular in Gaza respectively where twinning consists in i) a regular video link update from students every month ii) the publishing of an online blog in which students from the aforementioned universities can communicate about their lives and UCL students can ask questions (and vice versa) iii) the opportunity for a yearly exchange programme between at least one student from Al-Quds University in WB and a UCL student & at least one student from Al-Azhar University in Gaza and a UCL student in order for the Palestinian students to communicate in person what life is like in the oPt and moreover for the aforementioned UCL students to experience first-hand what life may be like in the oPt, accepting that the British Government permits travel to those regions

39. To reiterate the UCLU Friends of Palestine society’s right to raise issues that concern the student body, criticise the GOI and its policies, as well as highlight atrocities that contravene International Humanitarian law and not treated unlike other societies for doing such

4.6. Motion: Untitled

Proposer: Jamal Saleh, Greek & Latin 2, 60080600
Passed: Annual General Meeting, Reconvened 5 March 2008
Lapses: Autumn 2009

Motion: Untitled

This Union believes:

1. That UCL (not the Union) is prepared to endorse a Government lifting of the cap on tuition fees, currently standing at £3070.00 per annum for undergraduates.

This Union further believes:

1. That, in consequence, UCL is prepared to indulge in a educational system which becomes socially exclusive in monetary terms, both from the outset and in consequence, as students who cannot afford the initial expenses attached with coming to university will be further put off by potentially higher fees and those going to university will be left in debt to a greater extent once they have reached the £15,000 pa. wage or salary threshold.
2. That UCL, along with other universities, will seemingly in turn not be focusing as greatly on receiving students to educate them but on the amount they can pay, thereby decreasing the proportion of students at UCL from the UK or those aided by LEAs.

This Union resolves:

1. To aid future students at UCL and other institutions nationwide by actively discouraging UCL from such moves through a campaign, potentially involving petitions and perhaps a protest.
2. To alert all UCL students of this report via UCL Union.
3. To work with other institutions, whether within the University of London or otherwise, to rally the greatest amount of student support as possible.
4. To encourage debate between students at UCL and those within UCL making such a decision.

4.7. Motion to Stop the Deportation of Guy Njike

Proposer: Sara Hall, 2nd year PhD Hebrew and Jewish Studies department
982615575

Passed: Annual General Meeting Reconvened 5 March 2008

Lapses: Autumn 2009

Motion to Stop the Deportation of Guy Njike

This Union Notes:

1. Guy Njike (University of London, Human Rights post-graduate student 2004) is currently facing deportation to Cameroon.
2. Guy Njike was imprisoned and tortured by the government of Cameroon as a result of his non-violent political dissent as a member of the Social Democratic Front and fears further imprisonment and torture should he be forced to return.
3. The Foreign Office's report on Cameroon notes "NGOs and UN Special Rapporteur on Torture have highlighted extra-judicial executions, protracted detention without trial, torture of detainees and appalling prison conditions in recent years."
4. The US State Department's report on Cameroon "The government [of Cameroon]'s human rights record remained poor, and it continued to commit numerous human rights abuses. Security forces committed numerous unlawful killings; they regularly engaged in torture, beatings, and other abuses, particularly of detainees and prisoners. Impunity was a problem in the security forces. Prison conditions were harsh and life-threatening."
5. Guy Njike has lived in the UK for nine years, attended and graduated from the University of London and maintains extensive social, personal, and community ties with the UCL and University of London community.
6. University of London current students and alumni have organized a campaign against Guy Njike's deportation. They have organized and carried out several recent public demonstrations and collected over 1600 signatures and supporters include Jeremy Corbyn MP and Lorde Joffe CBE,

This Union Believes:

1. That deporting Guy Njike to Cameroon would amount to complacency in human rights violations against him.
2. That Guy Njike was a non-violent political prisoner working for democracy and human rights in Cameroon
3. That these deportation proceedings should be opposed

This Union Resolves:

1. To mandate the Union Executive to draft and sign an open letter to the Home Secretary and Minister of State for Borders and Immigration calling on them to reexamine Guy Njike's case and prevent his deportation and to send a copy of that open letter to all University of London student publications.
2. To mandate the Union Executive to issue a press release publicizing the Union's position as defined in the 'believes' section to as many available media outlets as feasible.

3. To mandate the Media and Communication's Officer to add a text link on the Union's front page to <http://stopdeportationofguy.wordpress.com> within seventy two hours.
4. To permit the campaign to stop the deportation of Guy Njike to collect donations from students at the Union's building in 25 Gordon Street and to allow and facilitate their organization of a benefit event for Guy Njike in the Union should they wish to do so.

4.8. NUS Motion

Proposed: Alex Jordon, History Yr 2 50470493
Passed: Annual General Meeting, Reconvened 5 March 2008
Lapses: Autumn 2009

NUS Motion

This Union Notes:

- 1. NUS extraordinary conference on 4 December 2007 endorsed a proposed new NUS constitution. This requires ratification at Annual Conference to come into effect.*
- 2. The proposed NUS constitution includes: the replacement of the current NUS NEC with an NUS board, modelled on charities and similar voluntary organisations, which would include neither the NUS Liberation officers nor a 'block of twelve' currently elected by proportional representation, but would include non-student members.*
- 3. That under the proposed NUS constitution, the current system in which conference debates policy motions put forward by students unions is replaced by a series of policy documents drawn up by other smaller, less representative forums.*
- 4. UCL Union Council voted against holding the NUS extraordinary conference on governance.*
- 5. Upon receiving proposals of a UCLU governance review, Union Council voted against adopting changes similar to those proposed by the NUS governance review, including non-student trustees.*

This Union Believes:

- 1. Students Unions ought to be political organisations, controlled by students for student collective interests.*
- 2. The balance of power in students unions should favour grassroots organising by ordinary students, not top level bureaucracy by people who are not engaged in any studies.*
- 3. That although the NUS is in clear need of reform, the NUS governance review's new constitution makes it worse, not better. With the NUS governance review the NUS would be less democratic and less accountable and ultimately even less relevant to students than it is now. Were the NUS to adopt its new constitution,*

This Union Resolves:

- 1. To mandate the Union's NUS delegation to attend and vote against all votes on adopting the proposed NUS constitution.*
- 2. To mandate the Union's NUS delegation to vote in favour of the amendment to motion number 512 "Oppose the proposed new NUS constitution"*

3. To mandate the Union's NUS delegation to vote in favour of the amendment to motion number 501 "Reject the Governance Review – defend and extend democracy in NUS"

4.9. Motion on Troops out of UCL

Proposed: Sham Rajyaguru, SSEES 51445782
Passed: Annual General Meeting, Reconvened 5 March 2008
Lapses: Autumn 2009

Motion on Troops out of UCL

This union notes:

- 1. That while military organizations such as the Officer Training Corps, University Royal Navy Units, Territorial Army are an external organization and not a UCL Union club or society they have frequently been given access to UCL Union Freshers Faire and ReFreshers Faire. This has included multiple large stalls with multimedia displays and representatives in military uniform, giving military organizations that contribute to recruitment greater exposure than allotted to Union societies.*
- 2. That the Officer Training Corps is a branch of the Army, members may be called up for active duty even while in university should the Army claim to be in a 'national emergency.' As such, Officer Training Corps cadets constitute a reserve military force which along with other reserve forces, enable the government to engage in a more aggressive foreign policy, deploying its active forces abroad rather than needing to employ active forces in national defense. Officer Training Corps put students under the command of full time military officers.*
- 3. That the chief function of the Officer Training Corps is military recruitment.*
- 4. That this Union has already passed several motions condemning UCL's financial involvement in the military industry.*
- 5. That Cambridge Students Union banned the Officer Training Corps from its freshers events in 1999 due to a conflict with its non-discrimination policy given the Officer Training Corps prohibition of homosexuals at the time. The Officer Training Corps recruitment policy remains out of order with UCL Union's non-discrimination policy because it does not accept students from certain nationalities or who are older than 30. Goldsmiths Students Union and LSE Students Union have recently passed motions prohibiting military recruitment at their freshers events.*
- 6. That UCL Union already has a standing policy against investment in companies that produce weapons for the military.*

This union believes:

- 1. That providing the Officer Training Corps stalls at Freshers Faire alongside official Union societies, amounts to an implied endorsement of the Corps and the Army and their activities, by the Union. It further provides the Officer Training Corps direct access to all UCL students interested in Union organized activities at the Freshers Faire, directly aiding Officer Training Corps recruitment.*
- 2. That because the British military under the Labour Government is currently engaged in an aggressive war overseas, for the Union to use its resources to*

encourage students to join the military or participate in military recruitment activities at this time would give political and material support to the war.

3. *That it is inconsistent for the Union to lobby UCL to end its involvement with companies that provide weapons for the military, as is Union policy, while the Union is actively involved in promoting organizations that provide officers for the military.*
4. *That the Union should not endorse or promote the Officer Training Corps, the military or the foreign policy of the Labour government and the Bush white house.*

This union resolves:

1. *not to grant military organizations such as the OTC, ULAS, URNU, or TA a place at freshers faire or other UCL Union organized events and premises or media.*
2. *To prohibit any military recruitment activity at UCL Union events and premises.*
3. *To mandate all UCL Union representatives to University of London Union to lobby ULU to ban the Officer Training Corps and other military recruiters from its freshers events and to remove the link to the Officer Training Corps from its website.*
4. *To not interpret this motion as banning or obstructing the sale of poppies at the Union, appearances by members of the royal family, or attendance of student members of the military at Union events in a personal capacity.*
5. *To not associate with the OTC, ULAS, URNU, Territorial Army or regular armed forces, but to hold no resentment or disrespect for students who choose too.*

4.10. Medsin RUMS Motion for Union Council

Proposer: Alex Nesbitt Life Sciences 1st Year 700808
Passed: Union Council, 18 March 2008
Lapses: Autumn 2009

Medsin RUMS Motion for Union Council

We are submitting this as an emergency motion as this motion cannot be delayed for a hearing until next year because the government review is currently underway and the effectiveness of lobbying the NUS and government would be reduced by then.

This Union Notes:

1. The government is considering extending the The National Health Service (Charges to Overseas Visitors) Act 2004, to include charging for primary care. This would put vital care out of reach of many vulnerable people including those who have been human trafficked and failed asylum seekers. Some failed asylum seekers have legitimate residence in the UK (section 4s).

This Union Believes:

1. Primary care should be available to all regardless of immigration/asylum status. It is not economical to deny primary care to these people; it would be cheaper to provide it. Denying care will put students and others at unnecessary public health risk.

This Union Resolves:

1. To sign the MedAct/Medsin joint statement on Access to Healthcare.
2. To publicise this statement of support on uclu.org along with a link for individual students to sign.
3. To mandate the Media and Communication's Officer, Education and Welfare Officer, and all NUS delegates to lobby National Union of Students to sign the statement and report progress on this to the proposer by end of March and to Union Council at the next meeting.
4. To mandate the Media and Communication's Officer, Education and Welfare Officer, and all NUS delegates to lobby local students unions to sign this statement and report progress on this to the proposer by end of April.

4.11. Emergency Motion to Union Council

Proposer: Craig Griffiths, German 2, 50019029
Passed: Union Council, 18 March 2008
Lapsed: Autumn 2009

Emergency Motion to Union Council

This Union Notes:

1. UCL Union Constitution VIII. A. "Union Council shall exercise the powers and perform the duties of the Union, save those required to be exercised by a General Meeting or Referendum, or in some other manner under the terms of the Federation Agreement."
2. That the Sabbatical Officer Contract as stipulated in the Standing Orders states in F.2.b "The officer will be required individually and collectively with the rest of the Executive to ensure that all mandates from a GM or a meeting of Union Council or the Executive concerning Union Policy and activity are adhered to and implemented within a reasonable time scale.", it is therefore within Council's remit to mandate sabbatical officers concerning Union Policy and activity.
3. That the Nominations Contract for all Union officers states in D. 1,2. "should I fail to fulfil my job as outlined in the Standing Orders - a copy of which I have read - I may be no-confidenced and dismissed from the post. the standing orders provide that I may be deemed to have resigned should I fail to attend two consecutive meetings of Council or any Union Committee as required by my job description.". The contract provides no other means for dismissing or "suspending" a Union Officer from their post should they "fail to fulfil [their] job".
4. That the standing orders provide for No Confidence proceedings if and only if an officer is believed to have failed to fulfil the duties of their post as outlined in the Standing Orders, or if they are guilty of gross misconduct.
5. Holding a Union post is not a "student privilege as outlined in the Constitution and Standing Orders" as the Constitutional section on Membership Privileges lists "seek[ing] office in the Union" as a privilege but not holding office. To "suspend" a union officer from their post is therefore outside of the scope described in the Union's standing orders disciplinary section.
6. Union Resolution "Motion to Union Council to adopt the use of UCL Union Disciplinary Guidance" Proposed by Zoe Davies passed May 21st 2007.
7. That Union Council determines Disciplinary Procedures as specified by the Standing Orders.
8. That the 'Chief Executive' delivered a letter on March 11th to the General Secretary claiming to have "suspended" the non-existent "privilege to hold elected or appointed office in the Students Union" (which does not appear under the Constitution's membership privileges section as referred to in the standing orders on

disciplinary), that this letter did not contain any notice of allegations as required in Council Disciplinary Procedures, that this letter did not contain the Disciplinary Guidance as adopted by Council.

9. That, days after the irregularities in the “disciplinary procedure” with regard to stating allegations were repeatedly and publicly exposed, “charges” which do not amount to behaviour that might be subject to disciplinary action as stipulated in the standing orders were issued to the General Secretary by the ‘Chief Executive’. These charges were 1 “approv[ing] issuing of voting slips to person or persons without proof of UCL Union membership”, which is explicitly permitted under Standing Order section 9 I. H. that specifies that Proof of Union membership may be required to vote or speak at a GM (not shall) and standard practice (and therefore not subject to disciplinary action under Union policy previously noted), 2. that an “unconstitutional quorum count” (note: the constitution provides no guidance on quorum counts) took place after the General Secretary had vacated the Chair of the AGM and was therefore not responsible for the conduct of the meeting during a debate on a “motion seconded by [the General Secretary]” who had in fact not seconded any motions, as a result of the General Secretary “count[ing] persons who had left the Reconvened AGM” when in fact the General Secretary did not act as an official vote counter for that debate (which can be confirmed by the Chair and vote tellers) and 3. that the General Secretary failed to uphold the duties of her post; a “charge” that is clearly covered under no confidence motion proceedings not disciplinary proceedings.

10. That in contrast to the category of issues that may serve as grounds for a vote of no confidence or censure, behaviour that constitutes a disciplinary offence in the standing orders is harassment, in union policy, verbal abuse. The General Secretary is not accused of behavior of the type that has ever previously been referred to a disciplinary panel.

11. That a motion of no confidence against the General Secretary as chair of the Annual General Meeting was debated at the General Meeting. The result was that the Union membership voted to maintain confidence in the General Secretary as chair of the meeting.

12. That the “suspension” of the General Secretary occurred the day before Governance Committee met to consider “suspending” the results of the Annual General Meeting. That had the General Secretary not been “suspended”, the vote would have gone the other way.

13. That the vote to “suspend” the results of the General Meeting came after the Governance Committee meetings time had expired, after Jim Hunkin acting as Chair of the meeting had refused to allow three members of the committee to take a vote on a motion they had tabled (at the time constituting a majority), resulting in them vacating the room, with only three members of the committee present (with a quorum set at four non-sabbatical elected members).

14. That the Constitution stipulates that decisions taken at a General Meeting override decisions taken at the Committee level.

15. That the Services and Events Officer Olivia Alford informed members of Governance Committee that “The sabbaticals have taken the decision this morning to suspend Jim as Acting Finance and Administration Officer pending further investigation into the accusations laid out in the motion, and in light of the complaint received regarding the meeting of Governance Committee on 12th March.” This is

not the normal proceedings dealing with no confidence motions or complaints as specified in the Standing Orders.

16. That the Chair of Governance Committee, defined by the Standing Orders as the General Secretary, is responsible for interpretation of disciplinary procedure under the Standing Orders; that the Chair of Union Executive, also defined by the Standing Orders as the General Secretary, is responsible for hearing appeals on procedural matters under the standing orders. That the Finance and Administration Officer is responsible for receiving motions and special resolutions to Union Council. That any "suspension" of these two officers creates the potential for a constitutional crisis

This Union Believes.

Part 1:

1. That the "suspension" of Samantha Godwin as General Secretary was beyond the powers of the sabbatical officers as it was not in compliance with the standing orders and policy on disciplinaries, and improper conduct on their part as it clearly served a political utility whether intentional or not. That the sabbatical officers moreover have no power to interpret the standing orders with regard to disciplinary procedures as this is reserved for the Chair of Governance Committee and the standing orders do not provide for replacing the chair of a standing committee.

2. That by publicizing in an all student email on Thursday March 13 that the sabbaticals have "after investigating complaints" taken the decision to "suspend" the General Secretary their public comment inferred the guilt of the General Secretary and thereby potentially prejudices any independent inquiry into her conduct. This claim was made despite the absence of any substantial "investigation" into the "complaints" and therefore not only potentially prejudicial but libelous.

3. That any findings of with regard to the veracity of the "charges" subsequently issued to the General Secretary (after having been withheld or non-existent in violation of standing orders) are irrelevant since none of the "charges" are of behaviour that might be subject to a disciplinary panel under Union Policy.

4. That any complaints against the General Secretary with regard to her job performance may only be legitimately addressed through no confidence or censure motions. That these legitimate means were not attempted because the complainents doubted that they could succeed.

Part 2:

That Governance Committee like any other Council standing committee is constitutionally prohibited from "suspending" or otherwise overruling results of a General Meeting.

Part 3:

That the "disciplinary procedure" has been abused in such a way as to create a constitutional crisis in the Union and any potential for this to occur in the future is undesirable and should be addressed.

This Union resolves:

Part 1:

1. To mandate the sabbatical officers to drop all “charges” against Samantha Godwin lift her “suspension” and disallow them from initiating any new disciplinary proceedings except with prior assent from Union Council. Union Executive may not act on behalf of Council in this matter and this resolution may not be construed as acknowledging any legitimacy in the Sabbatical’s claim of having “suspended” Samantha Godwin as General Secretary.
2. To mandate the sabbatical officers collectively to issue a public apology to Samantha Godwin on the Official Union Notice Board and the all union member email list. This apology must include a statement that A. The “suspension” was considered by Council to be an abuse of procedure and the sabbatical officers have been mandated to reverse their actions B. that the sabbatical officers acted inappropriately and must be done before 1pm March 19th.
3. To require that any grievances against a Union officer’s actions in an official capacity, or actions undertaken in the course of their duties as a Union officer, be addressed by motions of no confidence or motions of censure as allowed in the Standing Orders.
4. To condemn any Sabbatical officer failing to abide by this resolution in contempt of Council as out of order. Any actions undertaken by any Union officer or committee in contravention to these resolutions are null and void.

Part 2:

1. To recognize that the motions passed at the Reconvened Annual General as official union policy.
2. To mandate the sabbatical officers to publicize this resolution in the all union member email list and Official Union Notice Board and must be done before 1pm March 19th.
3. To condemn any Sabbatical officer failing to abide by this resolution in contempt of Council as out of order.

Part 3:

1. To suspend all standing orders relating to disciplinary proceedings, thereby revoking any potential claim (spurious or otherwise) of the Sabbatical Officers to “suspending” the General Secretary and the Acting Finance and Administration Officer, until Council can implement new standing orders on disciplinary proceedings to eliminate this potential for abuse.
2. To instruct Governance Committee to draft and propose a special resolution to amend the standing orders on disciplinary procedures so as to eliminate any potential loophole for abuse; for this proposal to be presented at the next meeting of Union Council.

Part 4:

1. To refer all matters addressed by governance committee in its last meeting back to governance committee.

Spring 2010

5.1. Motion to Union Council: Nestlé at UCL Union

Proposed: Kate Rowley, Archaeology 4, 40668255
Passed: Union Council, 29 April 2008
Lapses: Spring 2010

Motion to Union Council: Nestlé at UCL Union

UCL Union notes

1. This Union's existing Policy to boycott Nestlé.
2. The National Union of Students' existing Policy to boycott Nestlé.
3. That an advert for Nestlé Kit Kat was filmed in the UCL Quad in March 2008.

UCL Union believes

1. That Nestlé policy has not changed since the boycott began.
2. That Nestlé have shown an increase in sales since this advert was first screened.
3. That disinvesting from Nestlé is a crucial part of any ethical investment policy.

UCL Union resolves

1. To mandate the Education and Welfare Officer to write a letter to UCL expressing disappointment at their decision to allow Nestlé to film on campus, and reminding them that the students have chosen to boycott Nestlé.
2. To send a copy of the above letter to Nestlé.
3. To mandate the Sabbatical Officers to produce a statement, to be displayed on the Union Notice Board, explaining Union Policy with regard to Nestlé and disassociating the Union from the Kit Kat adverts.
4. To produce information posters in association with Baby Milk Action explaining why we boycott Nestlé and to display these posters in all commercial services.
5. To mandate the Welfare Officer (2008/09) to expand the campaign for ethical investment to include a call to disinvest from Nestlé.
6. To mandate the Education and Welfare Officer and the Welfare Officer (2008/09) to work with UCL to explain why we are calling for ethical investment and which companies are affected by UCL Union policy in this area.

5.2. Motion to Council: Arts Colours Awards

Proposer: Charlotte Green, SLAIS III
Passed: Union Council, 8th May 2006
Lapses: Spring 2008

Proposed: Jen Currigan (Arts Officer) Medicine 6, 20266356
Passed: Union Council, 29 April 2008
Lapses: Spring 2010

Motion To Council: Arts Colours Awards

This Union Believes:

1. UCLU currently does not have "Arts Colours"
2. UCLU currently gives "Sports Colours" to those students who have shown commitment to sport teams and clubs
3. UCLU gives "Arts Awards" for achievement within the arts but does not give awards to commitment and dedication to the arts.
4. Student deserve to be awarded for their commitment and not just ability

This Union Further Believes:

1. Currently those from Arts Societies who have shown commitment can be awarded "Social Colours"
2. It is very hard to compare those showing commitment to shows and similar to those who participate in Union committees, making deciding award level difficult
3. "Social Colours Ball" has so many people getting awards that not everyone would be able to attend in its current form

This Union Resolves:

1. UCLU to have "Arts Colours" in a similar format to that of "Sports Colours" from academic year 08-09
2. To award "Arts Colours" to those involved with arts societies and/or artistic activities for commitment not just ability
3. Have an "Arts Colours Committee" to decide to awards to be given
4. "Arts Colours Committee" will consist of:
 - a. Student Activities Officer (Chair)
 - b. Arts Officer (Sec)
 - c. Communications and Services Officer
 - d. Activities Executive officer
 - e. Societies Officer
 - f. 5 elected Representatives from Arts Board
 - g. 1 elected Representative from Societies Board
 - h. Garage Theatre Manager (In Attendance)
 - i. Union Staff as required by agenda (In Attendance)
5. Awards should be given at 3 levels
 - a. Arts Commendation
 - b. Arts Colours
 - c. Arts Centenary Colours
6. "Arts Colours" will be presented at an event at the end of term 2

7. "Arts Awards" will be presented at the same event at the end of term 2

5.3. Motion on the future of Senate House Library to Union Council 20th May

Proposed: Sol Gamsu, ESPS 1 60692
Passed: Union Council, 20 May 2008
Lapses: Spring 2010

Motion on the future of Senate House Library to Union Council 20th May 2008

This Union Notes:

1. That members of UCL (including staff, undergraduates, taught and research postgraduates, associates and others) accounted for the largest number of registered users from any one particular University of London (hereafter U of L) institution at Senate House Library (hereafter abbreviated to SHL) in the academic year 2006-2007. The U of L institutions with over 1000 registered users in the academic year 2006-2007 were as follows: UCL 5188, Birkbeck 3293, KCL 2870, SOAS 2205, Goldsmiths 2142, Queen Mary 1995, Royal Holloway 1612, LSE 1377. The total number of registered users of SHL in that year was 22846.
2. That in the academic year 2005-06 students based at Bloomsbury institutions (specifically UCL, KCL, SOAS, Birkbeck, the Courtauld Institute, the Institute of Education London School of Tropical Hygiene and Medicine, SOAS, the School of Pharmacy and LSE) accounted for 73% of U of L registered users at SHL, 77% of user visits, 75% of total time spent in the library and 68% of off-site accesses to e-resources.
3. That some UCL lecturers presume the availability of books at SHL when drawing up reading lists and selecting required readings for courses.
4. That the British Library's reader space is, as at UCL, under pressure during the run up to exams and that this causes tensions between postgraduate/research users and undergraduate users .
5. That SHL provides UCL students with further access to study space and computer facilities. This includes access to a further 538 reader study spaces; the combined total of reader study spaces at UCL's Bloomsbury libraries is 1163, less than is provided at LSE's British Library of Economic

and Political Science – 1360 and far below two of the other libraries receiving special funding by HEFCE: the Oxford Bodleian – 3892, Manchester University’s John Rylands library - 2669. There is also currently access to 50 computer workstations as well as photocopying facilities.

6. That under this years' Higher Education Funding Council for England (hereafter HEFCE) review SHL lost £706,000 of special funding for research libraries, and that this represents a loss of about 16% to SHL's total operating budget .
7. That SHL faces further financial problems due to Full Economic Costing. If the short fall due to HEFCE funding cuts is excluded, this still leaves SHL facing a £1m deficit .
8. That according to the March 2008 Higher Education Funding Council for England’s review: ‘A secure future [for SHL] will require deeper and more sustained collaboration between the college libraries and SHL.’
9. That an independent review of the services SHL offers to U of L members is taking place from April to December 2008 and this review will be put before College Heads for a final decision.

This Union believes:

1. That Senate House Library is an important academic resource used by a significant number of UCL studying arts and humanities and social science courses, particularly during times of heavy demand on UCL's main library but also throughout the year.
2. The loss of SHL would be detrimental to the academic development of UCL students as well as University of London and other Bloomsbury-based students both in terms of access to resources and study space.
3. One of the possible alternative arrangements listed by HEFCE, namely ‘the dispersal of part of its main collections to other University of London libraries and the leasing of space made vacant’ , would amount to the loss of an important shared academic resource and limit the access of UCL students to academic materials.

4. That UCLU should recognise the potential financial problems facing SHL and aim to maintain access for UCL and other University of London students to the resources provided by lobbying college management and library committee.
5. That the main collection of SHL ought to stay in its current location as this provides a central point of access to a substantial academic resource for a large number of Bloomsbury-based and other U of L students.
6. In the face of an uncertain future for the U of L, SHL is a resource which brings U of L students together because of a shared need for extra academic resources not provided or available at their home universities. The future of the U of L should not be allowed to undermine SHL as an institution which fosters the intellectual development of students from many different colleges.
7. That U of L Colleges' funding of SHL at its current levels does not cover the shortfall caused by the HEFCE funding cuts and the increased operational costs caused by Full Economic Costing.

This Union resolves:

1. To mandate the sabbatical team to write a letter to the Provost, College Council and library committee stating the continuing importance of SHL for UCL students from arts humanities and social science courses. Access to study space should also be mentioned.
2. To mandate the Education and Welfare officer to explain and state clearly UCLU's desire to maintain SHL as an academic resource for all U of L students, especially those in Bloomsbury-based institutions, at the next Library Committee meeting and at the next meeting of ULU Senate.
3. To mandate the E and W officer to coordinate with other Bloomsbury and U of L sabbatical officers to discuss and act to ensure that as far as possible U of L students' unions make a coordinated response aimed at maintaining SHL as an academic resource available for as many University of London students as possible.
4. To mandate future Education officers to lobby to ensure UCL and other U of L students' access to the resources provided by and through SHL,

particularly following the end of the independent review in December 2008 and to work with any other U of L sabbatical officers as appropriate.

5. That next year's (2008/2009) Education Officer should make a submission to the working group's review on the future of SHL stating and emphasising the importance of the library to all UCL and U of L students.

5.4. Motion to Union Council: DisarmUCL and Freshers' Fayre

Proposed: Craig Griffiths German 2, 50019029
Passed: Union Council, 20 May 2008
Lapses: Spring 2010

Motion to Union Council: DisarmUCL & Freshers Fayre

This Union notes:

1. UCL Union's support for the cross-society DisarmUCL campaign, expressed in several motions, most recently in an amendment made to the Ethical Investment motion, passed by Union Council on 20.11.07
2. That UCL Council (not Union council) has discussed Ethical Investment and DisarmUCL proposals for an Ethical Investment policy several times, but have not yet divested from Cobham PLC, nor extended the existing investments policy beyond precluding investment in tobacco companies
3. That disarmUCL is a cross-society campaign supported by UCLU Stop The War, UCLU People & Planet, UCLU Amnesty International, UCLU Medsin, The Cheesegrater, and London Student
4. That as a campaign rather than an independent society, DisarmUCL has no automatic qualification for a stall either at freshers fayre or at re-freshers fayre
5. That disarmUCL was only given a stall at the 2007 freshers fayre after repeated requests made to various union officers and union staff members, having made the initial request in the 2006/2007 academic year
6. That disarmUCL was not given a stall at the re-freshers fayre

This Union believes:

1. that freshers fayres and re-freshers fayres are an important chance for societies and campaigns to introduce themselves to new or continuing students
2. that new and continuing students should be given the chance to discover UCL's investment in the arms trade and to find out about the disarmUCL campaign
3. that DisarmUCL should have the same right of access to freshers fayres as Union Clubs or societies
4. that for disarmUCL campaigners to flyer or stand at either the UCL Union stalls or the stalls of its constituent member societies is either impractical, an infringement of Union freshers fayre regulations, or both

This Union resolves:

1. To automatically grant disarmUCL a stall at all freshers and re-freshers fayres, with two stall ticket holders; the same as every other club or society in terms of space

This Union mandates:

1. The outgoing (07-08) sabbatical team to communicate the "resolves" section of this motion to the appropriate member(s) of union staff
2. The incoming (08-09) sabbatical team to communicate the "resolves" section of this motion to the appropriate member(s) of union staff before the freshers fayre (september 2008) and re-freshers fayre (January 2009)

5.5. Emergency Motion to May 20 Council

Proposed: Samantha Godwin, Philosophy 3rd Year, 40518307
Passed: Union Council, 20 May 2008
Lapses: Spring 2010

Emergency Motion to May 20 Council

Union Notes:

1. We have only one more scheduled meeting of Union Council.
2. Several incomplete special resolutions are being drafted by members of Union Council which were put aside due to academic commitments to exams.

Union Believes:

1. Union council attendance has been very poor due to exams
2. The Union would benefit from having an additional Council meeting to discuss and pass special resolutions.

Union Resolves:

1. To call an additional meeting of Union Council to take place before the next (and final) scheduled meeting of Union Council. To email all members of Union Council to request their time tables for availability are sent to the Chair of Council. To mandate the Chair of Council to schedule a meeting to maximize attendance, giving at least four days notice.
2. To suspend standing orders relating to special resolution submission deadlines (noting that this does not affect constitutional requirements for notice) until the 1st of July.
3. To mandate special resolutions to be posted on the Union Notice Board and circulated to Council members 48 hours in advance of the council.

5.6. Emergency Motion on Standing Orders Improvements

Proposed: Samantha Godwin, Philosophy 3rd, 40518307
Passed: Union Council, 28 May 2008
Lapses: Spring 2010

Emergency motion on Standing Orders improvements⁴

This Union Believes:

1. Many issues regarding problems in the Union's structure have become apparent during the last academic year which could be addressed by changes to the standing orders.
2. The relationship between Union Executive and Union Council could be better clarified.
3. The roles of the Chair, Secretary and Assessor in standing committees could be better defined.
4. Procedures for elections from Council and Committees should be defined, procedures for replacing officers of committees should they resign ought to be defined.

This Union Resolves:

1. Insert Section 3 IV H. Where Council is electing members to relevant standing committees or College Committees that Councilors sit on and a position is contested, it shall employ a single transferable voting system whereby ballots are distributed to Council Members listing the positions to be filled and number to be elected. Council Members shall then indicate the name of the individual they wish to fill the positions in order of preference. Ballots shall then be manually counted in front of Council members, sorted with the same system of STV employed in Union General Elections. Where a position is uncontested or the number of Council members standing is equal to the number of positions to be filled, Council may vote yes or no to an appointment with a simple majority rather than employing STV.
2. Insert Section 4 II A. After "The Executive shall have the authority to act on behalf of Council between Council Meetings", "Such actions are subject to Councils approval and must be ratified by the following Council Meeting; actions not ratified in

⁴ Please note, the following is extracted from the minutes of the 28 May 2008:

"The Chair proposed that the special resolution on standing orders improvements be interpreted as an emergency motion to suspend the relevant parts of the Standing Orders and replace these parts with Union Policy.

The meeting moved to a vote and the following votes were recorded:

For: 11

Against: 6

Abstentions: 3

The Chair declared that the proposed interpretation was therefore

ACCEPTED."

For further clarification regarding this motion please contact the Finance & Democracy Officer at fd.officer@ucl.ac.uk

this manner shall be voided. Ratification by Council shall take place during the consideration of Executive Minute's reported to Council."

3. Insert Section 5 I. B. After "and submitted for central filing." "The Secretary may appoint a minute taker for this purpose."

4. Insert Section 5III.A. 6. Chairs actions may be taken in the area pertaining to the committees's remit in between meetings on behalf of the Committee; these actions must be ratified by the following meeting of the committee.

5. Insert Section 5. IV. A. 3. c. "Club/Societies disciplined in this manner may appeal to Union Council which may uphold or overturn Activity Board's decision with a simple majority; the disciplinary action shall not take force while an appeal is pending."