

agenda

Meeting:	Student Officer Committee
Date:	Thursday 19 February 2015
Time:	5.00 pm
Location:	Committee Room 1, the Council House
Code	SOC 1367

Departmental Presentation: Engagement and Education

- 1367 Statements from the Chair**

- 1368 Minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2014**
 To note: due to staff sickness these minutes were unavailable for some time, the minutes have subsequently been compiled from an audio recording. (See pages 3-7)

- 1369 Minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2015**
 (See pages 8-15)

- 1370 Matters Arising**

- 1371 Action Log**
 (See page 16)

- 1372 Financial Estimates 15-16 Proposal**
 A Presentation from the Chief Executive.

- 1373 Campaigns Budgets Update**
 (Papers to follow)

- 1374 Funding for the UEA Palestine Solidarity Campaign**
 A funding request from the Campaigns and Democracy Officer (See pages 17-19)

- 1375 Media Centre Consultation**
 A discussion topic from T Etheridge (Non-Portfolio Officer). (See page 20)

- 1376 Decisions made by Union Council**
 (See pages 21-39 for policies passed on 12 February)

1377 Officer Go Around/Reports

**1378 Reports on Priority Campaigns/Projects
Any Other Business**

1379 Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting
To note the next meeting will be held at 5.00 pm on 26 February in
Committee Room 1, the Council House.

Union of UEA Students Purpose:

"To enrich the life of every UEA student"

Minutes of the Student Officer Committee

(Notes compiled by the Secretary from audio recording)

4 December 2014

KEY DECISIONS

- Clarified wording of action for the Free Education Demo
 - Agreed Student Led Teaching Award Proposal
 - Agreed to the formation of the PG Referendum Working Group with additions to the personnel
 - Agreed Campaign Budget Spending Requests
 - Agreed to send a letter of solidarity to Warwick SU over the events surrounding the student occupation at Warwick
 - Statement to be drafted for SOC to condemn comments made on social media concerning the postponement of a debate involving UKIP
 - Action to be taken to improve presentation on the website of PTOs' activities and campaigns
-

Voting Members present:

Liz Cody (Non Portfolio Officer), Josh Wilson (Ethical issues Officer), Liam McCafferty (PG Education Officer), Freddie Redfern (Ethnic Minorities Officer), Tom Etheridge (Non Portfolio Officer), Theo Antoniou Phillips (Non Portfolio Officer), Connor Rand (UG Education Officer), S Glakousaki (International Officer), Iain Goddard (Environment Officer)

Chair

Chris Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy Officer)

In attendance:

Jim Dickinson (Chief Executive), Josh Clare (Head of Student Engagement), Lynne Simpkin (Head of Student Opportunities, James Heywood (Sports Development Coordinator)

Apologies:

Tony Moore (Democracy and Governance Coordinator), Holly Staynor (Welfare, Community & Diversity Officer) Yinbo Yu (Activities and Opportunities Officer), Dan Wrigglesworth (LGBT+ Officer), Dolly Ogunrinde (Women's Officer), Max Levene (Students with Disabilities Officer), Tom Southerden (Non Portfolio Officer), John Taylor (Mature Students' Officer), Oliver Steward (Postgraduate Officer).

1319 Departmental Presentation: Opportunities

L Simpkin and J Heywood outlined developments in their department.

Responding to a question as to whether there was a specific strategy at increasing the involvement of part-time students in sport, J Heywood noted there was not a specific strategy in place but this was an area that the Officers might look into.

J Heywood noted that D Wrigglesworth was looking into rainbow laces to promote Out In Sport.

1320 Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 November

The minutes were approved.

1321 Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 November

SOC debated what the wording of the action determined concerning the Free Education Demo had been. SO resolved through a vote that the wording had been to *"not send coaches to the demo"* rather than, as minuted *"remove support from"*. The minutes were approved.

1322 Action Log

There were no comments.

1323 Union Council Policy Implementation Review

There were no comments.

1324 Student Led Teaching Award Proposal

L McCafferty thought it would be useful to know what academics thought about the proposal as it might have a polarising effect.

C Jarvis noted that the UCU supported it as it highlighted best practice.

SOC agreed the proposal.

1325 Postgraduate Referendum

L McCafferty noted that the situation with regard to the Postgraduate Referendum was somewhat anomalous as the referendum rules covered all student referenda and this referendum would be for solely PG students. LM noted that in order to address this issue, the PG Referendum would be indicative with a set of rules fitting a restricted franchise. LM noted a working group would be set up to examine these issues and he would recommend that the working group should consist of: himself, O Steward (President of the GSA) and J Taylor as someone who had been involved in the initial discussions and who had asked to be part of the group.

C Rand thought it would be appropriate for the Campaigns and Democracy Officer to be part of the group.

C Jarvis agreed to serve on the group and suggested that it would be appropriate for D Hall, the Chair of the Democratic Procedures Committee, to be invited to join. CJ Noted that Mr Hall was also Secretary of the GSA and this would be helpful to the group.

L McCafferty noted that the group would endeavour to complete their work as early as possible in the New Year for two reasons: it would be not good to have the Referendum too close in time to the SU elections and that all the work around the PG student space referenced the Referendum and the sooner this could start the sooner improvements to PG services could be delivered.

SOC agreed to the formation of the Referendum Working Group with the above additions to the personnel.

1326 Campaign Budget Spending Requests

L McCafferty thought there was a need to clarify the budgets with PTOs having access to the funding pot.

SOC approved the spending requests.

1327 Officer Go Round/Report

L McCafferty: PTES data, UKIP debate, co-ordinating response to PG loans, nursing students' winter event

S Glakousaki: organising spring semester event, working with DOS on cultural awareness week and end of year workshop

J Wilson: attended Free Education demo on campus and in London, World Café, chaired Ethical Steering Group

I Goddard: Ethical Steering Group, ENV stall, lights in the square, Carbon Reduction meeting

T Antoniou Phillips: Transgender Awareness week, World Aids Day, LGBT training for Nightline

C Rand: Trustee work on UKIP meeting, students studying abroad review, assessment and feedback, radical teaching space, name of School on degree certificate, QAA, lab coats costs

L Cody: UKIP issue – noted had not had much information and had not known of decision, liaising with Bars over late payment of wages

T Etheridge: media law training, stalls, demo, trustee work

Chair: University Council, Defend Education Campaign, Ethical Steering Group, University have now signed up to Workers Rights Consortium.

1328 Reports on Priority Campaigns/Projects

Chair: Campus launch of Unison's Living Wage, disappointing attendance; pushing for SU involvement.

Chair: meeting with the Head of Accommodation to push on the lack of coherence between the University's pricing strategy and its widening participation agenda. Chair noted Officers were welcome to join the campaign's working group.

1329 Any Other Business

L McCafferty reported there had been a nationwide series of occupations by students to draw attention to the marketisation of education. LC reported that the one at Warwick had caused concern as the university had called in the police and the police actions captured on video appeared to be heavy-handed. LC noted the police actions had exacerbated the situation and led to more demonstrations. LC noted that other students' unions from across the country had been sending messages of solidarity to Warwick SU.

Chair suggested delegating the writing of a letter of solidarity to an individual Officer.

C Rand agreed to draft the letter and to post it on the SOC page for approval.

L McCafferty reported that there had been somewhat of a social media backlash directed at the statement LC had issued about UKIP. LC noted that a potentially libellous blog including a personal attack had been posted and that senior UKIP figures had also posted comments. LC wondered if it would be more appropriate for SOC, as a whole, to respond with a statement rather than an individual Officer.

L Cody thought that some of the comments had been horrendous. LC noted that constituents had asked about what had been going on but, because there had been no consultation between the FTOs and PTOs, LC had been unable to help them. LC believed that, despite the time constraints involved it would have been helpful if the FTOs had informed the rest of SOC about developments.

C Rand believed that it was unfortunate that the postponement of the event because of proper procedures not being followed had been twisted to fit UKIP's narrative of a conspiracy by a liberal elite at a university. CR noted, in response to LC, the time pressures involved and the need to respond quickly.

Chair noted that when Management Committee took decisions on matters such as this where SOC would have to answer for those decisions, L McCafferty, as Chair of Management, should send an immediate briefing to SOC. Chair noted, on a related issue, that SOC was meant to approve the minutes of Management Committee but was yet to receive any for the current term.

L McCafferty argued in relation to any SOC statement that it should draw attention to the fact that senior UK figures had commented favourably on the blog which had made offensive allusions to LC's ethnicity.

L Cody agreed and that the comments had been absolutely unacceptable.

SOC agreed that a SU staff member would be delegated to draft a statement which would then be discussed by SOC prior to publication.

T Etheridge asked as to previous discussions on raising the profile of PTOs and what this might involve.

L Cody noted one idea had been for PTOs to conduct monthly open forums on campus whilst another had been to hold a 'Union Week' which would focus on one overarching campaign.

I Goddard noted a constituent had wanted to know what IG had been doing as an Officer and had looked on the website which only showed IG's name and email address and nothing else.

J Wilson noted that Officers' actions were in the Council minutes but agreed that they could be in a PTO specific area of the website.

Chair noted that he would be meeting with SU staff to discuss how SU policy and campaigns could be better presented on the website and PTOs campaigns and activities would be part of this.

I Goddard asked if the proposed actions mapped out at an earlier informal meeting of Officers had been brought to SOC as he noted some such as a circulation of a SU staff who's who had not been actioned.

Chair noted that these had come to an earlier SOC meetings and that those actions which required some time and development would be brought to SOC in the spring semester.

1330 Time, Date and Place of Next Meeting (to be confirmed)

Minutes

Subject:	Student Officer Committee Minutes
Date:	Thursday, 5 February 2015
Paper:	SOC1368

Key Discussions

- The Waterfront's Activities
- Financial Position of the SU
- Items to be included in the 15-16 Budget
- The Anti-Terrorism Bill

Key Actions

- Officers to feed into Budget 'wish list'
- Agreed revised Election Timetable
- Noted funding for Go Global survey
- Agreed funding for attendance at Standing OUT LGBTQIA Women in Leadership

Union of UEA Students Purpose:

"To enrich the life of every UEA student"

Minutes of the Student Officer Committee

5 February 2015

Voting Members present:

Dolly Ogunrinde (Women's Officer), Max Levene (Students with Disabilities Officer), Josh Wilson (Ethical issues Officer), Liam McCafferty (PG Education Officer), Chris Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy Officer), Freddie Redfern (Ethnic Minorities Officer), Tom Etheridge (Non Portfolio Officer), Theo Antoniou Phillips (Non Portfolio Officer), Dan Wrigglesworth (LGBT+ Officer), Connor Rand (UG Education Officer), Yinbo Yu (Activities and Opportunities Officer), S Glakousaki (International Officer)

Chair

Holly Staynor (Welfare, Community & Diversity Officer)

Non-Voting Member present:

Jim Dickinson (Chief Executive)

In attendance:

Tony Moore (Democracy and Governance Coordinator), C Lear (Waterfront Coordinator), J Armstrong (Waterfront Venue Supervisor), J Williams (Waterfront Deputy Venue Supervisor)

Apologies:

Iain Goddard (Environment Officer), Josh Clare (Head of Student Engagement), Liz Cody (Non Portfolio Officer), Tom Southerden (Non Portfolio Officer), John Taylor (Mature Students' Officer), David Hall (Postgraduate Officer).

1355 Statements from the Chair

Chair noted that there would be an extra item brought forward in the Cycle of Business: a presentation on the Waterfront.

Departmental Presentation: the Waterfront

C Lear, J Armstrong and J Williams made a presentation on all aspects of the work of Waterfront. In particular, they highlighted the team's engagement and outreach with the local community.

Chair asked whether the opening of new alternative music venues, such as the Owl Sanctuary, had had an adverse effect on the Waterfront.

C Lear believed that the new venues should be viewed positively as they brought into the City more supporters of alternative music. CL noted that the Waterfront management had developed good relationships with the new venues and that there were good opportunities from cross-over audiences and joint-marketing.

J Wilson wondered whether the Propaganda nights had proved a success.

C Lear thought they had but that there was still some work to be done on delivery; CL noted that various possible means of support were being looked at, including putting on buses direct from campus.

Chair thanked the staff for their presentation.

Chair noted receipt of the GSA statement concerning the Referendum and noted that the General meeting for the Referendum would be held on 11 February.

1356 Minutes of the meeting held on 29 January

D Wrigglesworth noted they had been absent but they had been minuted as attending as well as giving apologies and T Etheridge noted that Livewire was spelt as one word, with these corrections the minutes were agreed.

1357 Matters Arising

There were none.

1358 Action Log

Chair noted that the lobbying on the DSA cuts would take another form than that of a letter and they would action this.

Chair noted, concerning trans-exclusion in election regulations, that they had spoken to NUS and their reaction had been somewhat negative and that they would be sending a policy proposal to NUS Conference.

1359 Financial Estimates Steering Discussion

J Dickinson made a presentation on the SU's financial position and the financial model it was working to, as in the current budget. J Dickinson advised that after the presentation, Officers would have an opportunity to feed their ideas into the setting of the next budget.

J Dickinson advised that for the December accounts, five months into the financial year the organisation was £115,000 off budget in relation to income and this was a poor set of results. JD advised this

cumulative variance would be hard to recover from in the current year. J Dickinson advised that management would be addressing the situation by:

- Reviewing whether the problem was due to performance or the financial model or a mixture of both
- Sharing the results of the review across the organisation
- Agreeing clear management action points
- Reviewing the results to inform the next budget cycle

J Dickinson outlined the old financial model of the organisation and contrasted it with the new financial model which had formed a central part of the Improvement Plan. JD advised that in the old model profits were hoarded within the commercial arm with little money being allocated to the charity; in contrast, the new model aimed at allocating more money to the charity to provide services to members whilst cutting money spent on infrastructure and bureaucracy. JD drew attention to the problems encountered in the transition from the old to new models and that there had, also, been some one-off costs incurred.

J Dickinson advised that, for the commercial arm, turnover was holding up but that profitability was a problem in the first semester. JD advised that this was due to:

- Some short term administrative problems with associated costs
- Implementation of the Living Wage for student staff
- Failing to get the balance right in reducing the queues in the shop and the cost of doing so
- In Bars and Unio the organisation had not been running the student staff % against the turnover%
- The small spend per head in ENTS

J Dickinson noted that the steep rise in student staff numbers had then led, in the case of Unio, to precipitate actions to cutback student staff hours and this had led to severe problems for the staff involved.

J Dickinson advised that management were reviewing systems and behaviours to increase the through put in the LCR.

SOC discussed the issues concerning the long queues and resultant serving time in Unio and the need to not incur fixed labour costs by planning staff ratios to match demand on an hourly basis.

J Dickinson advised that although Unio was the most visible area to Officers, it was not the most pressing issue, in financial terms, as the overspend in retail, ENTS and bars was far more concerning for the charity.

J Dickinson concluded the review of the finances by noting that the management accounts for January and February should reveal whether the issues were performance related or whether there was a deeper structural problem.

J Dickinson outlined the structure of the charity budget and noted it could be divided into four parts:

- Advocacy and representation
- Opportunities and activities
- Infrastructure
- Incoming money

T Etheridge asked if student numbers were to fall would this mean a cut in the Block Grant.

J Dickinson noted there was no correlation in place with regard to numbers and funding.

J Dickinson highlighted the extremely high number of societies per head but the extremely low overall expenditure.

J Dickinson highlighted areas of pressure on costs within the charity:

- Salaries and utilities
- Pension deficit
- Possible significant reduction in the amount reclaimed by the charity as to VAT

J Dickinson asked Officers for their thoughts on the financial reports and suggestions for spending on areas which would benefit their constituents.

Chair asked as to the testing in relation to the financial situation.

J Dickinson advised that there would be testing of performance across the organisation and this would run alongside a lobbying of the University as to issues such as the rising cost of the pension deficit.

S Glakousaki noted that the LCR was due to be refurbished and would this have an effect on the spend per head.

J Dickinson advised that improving the spend per head would play a key part in the refurbishment plans and, also, new systems would be in place to complement the changes to the physical structure.

C Jarvis noted that there was clear staff support for both FTOs and PTOs in some areas but there was no dedicated support in place for the C&D role, that of the Environment Officer, the Ethical Issues Officer or for the Non Portfolio Officers. CJ believed money should be budgeted to provide this support.

J Dickinson advised that a post had been envisaged to provide this support but had been deemed unaffordable and that provision of the support had been subsumed into the duties of another staff member. He advised that this solution had not been a success and that there should be an ambition to look again at creating the support post.

C Rand thought the increased spend on media societies had led to a revelation in what these societies had been able to deliver and he would want to see this protected in the budget. CR noted, however, that the SU would reach a point where it would have to consider the fact that it had a very low spending on sports and that members of

sports clubs had every right to complain of the low spend.

J Wilson asked how the SU's spending on sport compared to other students' unions.

C Rand noted it was in the bottom quartile.

SOC noted in passing the SU's investment in the Whitlingham Boat House.

Y Yu noted the number of complaints received as to the low spending on sports; YY also noted his belief that there should be an increase in the funding of Derby Day. YY believed there should also be an increase in funding for societies.

J Dickinson advised that there should be some cost benefit analysis as to the spending on both sports and societies to inform the budget setting.

S Glakousaki noted the high spending on the media societies.

T Etheridge clarified that a high proportion of the funding had come from the Alumni Fund and other grants.

S Glakousaki believed the ambition should be that all societies should have the same level of funding as the media societies and the elite sports clubs.

J Dickinson advised that a key part of helping societies develop was staff support and that changes were underway to free up staff from administrative duties to allow them to concentrate on direct development work with societies.

Y Yu noted work with SU staff on societies' handover and this would involve each society submitting a development plan when applying for funding.

J Dickinson advised that it was intended that there would be a focus on the following provisions:

- Societies
- Student Media
- Specific projects to address identified gaps in participation
- International and Postgraduate students
- Nursing students (with a staff member in place)

Y Yu asked that their request for an increase in the funding for societies should be minuted.

L McCafferty asked for some kind of analysis of outcomes in relation to funding to be brought to a future meeting to inform future decision making.

J Dickinson advised that this would be a good set of numbers to bring to the discussion of the budget estimates at Union Council.

SOC agreed that Officers would feed in to a wish list so that Management Committee would be able to then present SOC some clear budget choices.

J Dickinson advised Officers to have a look at how other students' unions prioritised spending and what kinds of special projects they ran

as this might be useful in building the wish list.

1360 Election Timetable Update

SOC agreed the revised Election timetable.

1361 Go Global/survey/experience leaflet

S Glakousaki gave a brief overview of Go Global. S Glakousaki noted the survey would collect information about what international students wanted from inductions and from their leaving experience.

1362 Officer Go Round/Reports

T Antoniou Phillips: attendance at University's Music Steering Group, looking at areas on campus where bands can rehearse

C Jarvis: reported World Café had taken place; thanked staff and Officers for their contributions

D Wrigglesworth: started Pride at UEA, emailed all Clubs and Societies

T Etheridge: Derby Day/Livewire

M Levene: reported exciting developments with an Access All Areas Group on campus which would establish principles for the University to pledge to follow in the design of future buildings

D Ogunrinde: organising self-defence class and empowerment workshop

S Glakousaki: multiple presentations to incoming INTO which were very successful; SG hoped that these would continue in future years

Y Yu liaising with NBS over an LCR event to celebrate the Chinese New Year

Chair: Well Being, organising events and liaising with media over coverage

1363 Reports on Priority Campaigns/Projects

C Jarvis drew SOC's attention to their written report.

S Glakousaki drew attention, in regard to International Fees, that the University set its own notional rate of inflation of 3% and this varied significantly from that in the wider economy which was around 2.2%.

T Antoniou Phillips asked for clarification on 'affordable' housing.

C Jarvis clarified that the University had refused to provide an institutional definition of 'affordable'.

1364 Decisions made by Union Council

C Jarvis reported that the working group on the Housing Co-op had already started meetings; C Jarvis invited interested Officers to attend.

Chair noted that they had spoken to the University about the Anti-Terrorism Bill and that they had been assured that the University opposed the provisions in the Bill and that the Vice-Chancellor had added their name to a letter condemning the provisions.

J Dickinson advised that a balancing provision had been added to the

Bill after debate in the Lords and this would add the duty of universities to maintain freedom of speech to counterbalance the duty to prevent the spread of terrorism. J Dickinson advised that the revised Bill was now likely to pass; although there was still some opposition from some quarters. J Dickinson characterised the compromise as a confection of positive and negative freedoms. J Dickinson noted the work that R Rawle had done last year to retain the caveat of the 'right to protest' in the University's General Regulations. J Dickinson, answering C Jarvis, advised that the NUS' position on the Bill was somewhat confused as the student movement applied a different level of sanctions against, for example, the BNP in contrast to those applied to the small group of radical Islamicist students whom the movement judged to be outside an accepted discourse.

1365 AOB

D Ogunrinde noted they had submitted an emergency item: a funding request for attendance at the Standing OUT LGBTQIA Women in Leadership; the amount requested was £100 and it would come from the Liberations Budget.

S Glakousaki asked how much was left in the Liberations Budget. J Dickinson advised that about half had been spent.

C Jarvis asked for a breakdown of the current funds in all the SOC budgets and that the request be minuted.

The Liberations Officers agreed to the funding request for attendance at Standing OUT LGBTQIA Women in Leadership.

T Etheridge reported that there had been a 'Chav' themed event run by a Club or Society in the LCR and asked that this be investigated.

1366 Time, Date and Place

5. 00 pm, 19 February in Committee Room 1, the Council Chamber.

SOC Action Log for 19 February 15

Date Commissioned	Action Required	Status	Assigned To:	Date to be actioned by:
5 June 14/2 October/23 Oct	Constitutionality of reserved places on Union Council for Rep Organisers to be investigated	Proposal to brought to SOC from Student Engagement	Chris	Jan 15
16 October 14	Letter to be send to NUS concerning trans-exclusion in election regulations	Liaising with NUS	Holly, Dan, Dolly	Nov 14
16 October 14	Public statement to be made on DSA Cuts in collaboration with NUA and City College	Liaising with University over joint declaration with NUA/City	Holly, Max, Chris	Nov 14
16 October 14	University to be lobbied over student accommodation in city centre	Lobbying continuing	Holly	Nov 14
15 January 15	PTOs to be asked to stay on during exam period to support successors	Ongoing	All	April 15
5 February 15	Cost benefit analysis on club and society activities to be made	To inform budget estimates for Council	Jim	April 15
5 February 15	Officers to feed in to a wish list for budget setting	To be emailed to Chair	All	19 Feb 15
5 February 15	Breakdown of funds in all Officer budgets to be brought to SOC	To be included in agenda papers	Jim	19 Feb 15

Project/Campaign Title: Funding for the UEA Palestine Solidarity Campaign

Amount of money requested: £150

Budget requested from: General Campaigns

Details of project (500 words max)

The title of the project is "Israeli Apartheid Week" (IAW), which is an international series of events that seeks to raise awareness about Israel's apartheid policies towards the Palestinians. This took place at UEA also in the past years. The IAW will take place in the period 23-27 of February, 2015. During that week, we aim at raising awareness on human rights and international law in the case of the Occupied Palestinian Territories and Israel, and on the injustices towards the indigenous people, the Palestinians, who are living under Israel's daily occupation in East Jerusalem, the Occupied West Bank, and in the Gaza Strip. We aim at doing so through:

- Projection of 2 movies and documentaries in two separate evenings
- Speaker from the Water Security Research Centre to talk about occupation and natural resources in Palestine
- Lecture with guest speaker to talk about Israeli apartheid policies and their impact on indigenous population, including marginalised people
- Cultural night with teaching of traditional Palestinian dance "Dabka," for an anthropological approach to local cultures under occupation with a Palestinian teacher from Cambridge
- Flyers and factsheets will be distributed during the week to all interested members

We wanted to do a series of events; one after another, to keep this alive and fresh in people's minds while introducing viewers to a variety of ways of looking at, and understanding Palestinian life under this occupation, as well as trying to understand why the occupation and the continued colonisation of Palestinian land is happening. Therefore we want to put on a series of events from speakers to films so that people can get a sense of what is happening and what they can do to help stop it.

How will this benefit our members? (300 words max)

Firstly, this project aim at bringing to attention of our members the situation in occupied Palestine, so that they can experience for themselves unreported and unheard sides of it. With such little discourse over the realities of life for everyday men, women, and children living there and with so much confusion about the conflict, we feel that by putting on these events we would be helping to educate anyone who is willing to learn about it. Therefore, the primary objective would be to raise awareness and enhance our members' knowledge about important issues of international relations, human rights, and human dignity.

Second, it will provide an opportunity to our members to deepen their knowledge about specific issues related to: water, land, and natural resources under occupation; refugees in international law; history of the Middle East; and minority religions of the Middle East.

Third, it would provide an opportunity to our members to get acquaintance with Middle Eastern culture through the movies we will show and the cultural night we will organise. This will give an opportunity to learn new dances and a new culture through Middle Eastern arts.

Finally, it would provide an arena for engaging in campaigning and activism for those who want to take forward this specific issue of occupation in Palestine and make a difference.

Number of members directly benefited: All members

Number of members benefited by extension: Entire membership

How will you ensure this benefits hard to reach/liberation/underrepresented groups? (300 words max)

First of all, as a population living under a daily occupation with no political or civil rights and often distorted or no media coverage, by putting on these events we are ensuring that the Palestinian people's plight is being listened to.

Second, the committee members of our society are mainly from marginalised groups: there is a majority of people of ethnic minorities, postgraduates, and LGBT people. In this way, they will ensure that their friends, and people of similar background will be actively involved in the events.

Third, we aim at promoting part of the events with other societies in order to ensure the participation of underrepresented groups: International Students Society for people of Ethnic Minorities/Black background; GSA for postgraduates' students, cinema society, amnesty society, Muslims society, etc. However, our society will bear the costs of the organisation of the week. In order to include and advertise the event widely including to marginalised groups, the members of the society will

have a stand in the hive before the IAW to raise awareness about the mentioned topics and to advertise the events.

In addition, the events like the movies and talks will be introduced and coordinated or mediated by people of liberation background: a female student from Ethnic Minorities origins; a mature LGBT student from Ethnic Minorities origins; and we are looking into disabled students as well.

We will also ensure that the rooms that we will book will be easily accessible to our students, in order to guarantee the opportunity to disable and access problem people to be able to participate. Also, among the speakers/coordinators and dancer teachers that we choose there are: LGBT+ people, and Ethnic Minorities people. This is in consideration of diversity reasons.

Finally, we aim at involving groups living similar situations of occupation to get involved in our activities, and liberation group are our main target as we cannot pursue Palestinian rights of human rights and respect of international law and forget about other groups' rights. Also because when we talk about Palestinians, we talk about liberation groups within Palestinian society as well,, whose rights are further not violated because of their being Palestinians, and because of them belonging to liberation and marginalised groups such as LGBT, women, ethnic minorities, and disabled. Those are even more affected by the Israeli occupation and apartheid policies, and therefore we will particularly call on marginalised and liberation groups members of UEA to join our events during the IAW. As in the recent movie *Pride* someone said "I don't understand how you can support gay rights but not miners' rights. And support workers' rights and not women's rights. Then the man replies "Two hands, that's what the labor movement means, should mean. You support me, I support you. Whoever you are, wherever you come from. Shoulder to shoulder, hand to hand." And in this context, we need to support Palestinians rights, but also everyone's rights.

Consultation over the Media Centre

A discussion topic from T Etheridge, with backing from O Sanham (Livewire Station Manager), G Scott (Concrete Editor-in-Chief), Z Jones (UEA: TV)

The constitution says, and it is a core belief that the union is for students and by students. Decision making should therefore, come from the elected representatives, if not the student body as a whole.

Whilst this is a organisation wide issue (as was shown in the survey of Union Councillors in Issue 308 of Concrete), this topic comes from me due to my personal involvement in the Media Collective, and recent announcements. It is also felt that these issues should be known by the wider officer committee.

On Monday, the three societies discovered that the media centre would be closing on 17th April. We had had no prior knowledge (other than a passing mention to Geri) of this decision or any role in the consultation. Concrete have at least two issues following this date, all three societies have the Big Weekend to cover - indeed we have been asked to provide some coverage from Union House - and Livewire have always planned to, and for the last few years at least have, broadcast up until the end of the exam semester.

The practical ramifications of closing the shared media space are multiple, the most obvious of which will be the loss of the studio and production space for Livewire. These, are patently essential for broadcast. Concrete's editorial independence will be further questioned and difficult to justify should they move into the Union office. Both TV and Livewire have an inherently noisy aspect, and Concrete have 32 section editors who come and go at various points; this will no doubt be unwelcome by some in the main office and will be disturbing.

Further, the three societies operate constantly. Almost every day of the week you will find students in the media centre from 9am until midnight. Livewire broadcasts until midnight every single day. Will this be viable in whatever temporary space is provided?

So all of this brings a number of questions. How will the three societies continue to function without space or facilities to do so? Where will the societies be based, and where will funding for any technical costs associated with the move come from? How was this decision made without consulting even just the presidents of the societies? And how do we ensure that something like this doesn't happen again?

T Etheridge (Non-Portfolio Officer)

1663 Motions to NUS National Conference adopted by Union Council 12
February 2015

1663 (a) Motion to HE Zone

“Students aren’t consumers but they do have rights”

Proposed: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Seconded: Theo Antoniou-Phillips (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Conference Believes

1. Over the past few years Government has tripled HE fees in England yet has done nothing to strengthen students’ rights.
2. The marketization of education has brought with it a flurry of suggestions that students are now consumers.
3. This “students as consumers” approach promised more power to students that has never materialised.
4. Research by “Which?” in 2014 found widespread problems in the practices of HEIs - in poor information and advice, standards for complaints, and exploitative and one sided student contracts.
5. This year the Competition and Markets authority found institutions seriously lacking in their procedures and practices.

Conference Further Believes

1. “Which?”, the consumers association, campaigns “to make consumers as powerful as the companies they face every day”, and in doing so they work to support individuals with information about their rights, and consumers collectively with campaigns for change.
2. Few of us would argue with the idea that we should campaign to make students as powerful as the universities and colleges they face every day, and in doing so we should work to support students with information about their rights, and students collectively with campaigns for change.
3. Whilst our squeamishness about viewing students as consumers is understandable, it plays into the hands of powerful university and college managers who want to do all they can to retain disproportionate power over students.
4. A smart student movement would say “No” to students as consumers whilst supporting and championing regulation that makes students powerful in the face of well funded, exploitative and highly defensive institutions
5. Often what should be basic student rights are touted as special features of a particular HEI as part of the process of competing with others, or labelled “consumer rights” to put us off arguing for them.
6. That a system of Post qualifications admissions is long overdue, has clear WP benefits and should be imposed by Government as a condition of funding
7. That UCAS should consider offering an institutional switching service for all students after their first term, incentivising institutions to provide a good student experience
8. There should be a statutory duty on HEIs and FEIs to fund and support students' union/independent advocacy for students
9. A new code of Post 16 Governance should be issued guaranteeing student and staff involvement in both the Governance and executive management of Universities and Colleges

10. There should be legal backing for student charters which should exist in every HEI and FEI
11. The Government should introduce regulation for any HEI or FEI charges made to students outside of a main fee- and if there are fees, what students get in exchange for that fees should be subject to clear regulation
12. If there have to be student loans, the terms of repayment should be specified in statute

Conference Resolves

1. To work with the CMA and Which to strengthen students' rights in HEIs and FEIs
2. To mandate the NUS HE Zone to include student protection demands in post election work with political parties
3. To run a major campaign involving SUs calling on these issues to be included in legislation or regulation as soon as possible

521 Words

1663 (b) Looking Past May – Fighting Fees and Cuts After the General Election

Proposer: Chris Jarvis (Campaigns & Democracy Officer)

Seconder: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer)

Conference Believes:

1. The current coalition government has presided over devastating economic policy which has seen ruthless cuts to public services, education and welfare.
2. The economic approach of austerity has proven to be a failed model. Since 2010, we have seen rising unemployment, ongoing pay freezes for ordinary workers and millions of people turning to food banks, at a time when the rich have increased their wealth and the public debt has not disappeared.
3. The trebling of tuition fees as well as cuts to education budgets, EMA and support for disabled students have been part of an intentional process of marketization of further and higher education, whereby the aim has been to create a system where a degree is seen as a commodity to be bought, rather than a public good.
4. The political and economic system which has produced these attacks on education and students is the very same one that is overseeing ongoing austerity and the mass privatisation of our public services.
5. Whichever political party wins in May, the outlook is grim – the parties who will be able to win a workable majority or be the largest party in any ensuing coalition are currently wedded to austerity and a market based approach to education.

Conference Further Believes:

1. NUS has a long history of campaigning against fees and cuts, and has played a key role, along with other groups within the student movement

in overturning the proposed privatisation of student debt and delaying cuts to DSA.

2. Working with allies within the student movement, trade unions and other campaign groups, an effective and broad based campaign can be built and sustained to fight and end the marketization of education and austerity policies.
3. It is vitally important that after the General Election, we continue to campaign in this vein. Whoever wins in May, they must be held to account and as a movement we must continue the campaign against fees and cuts.

Conference Resolves:

1. To continue to campaign aggressively against the marketization of education and austerity.
2. To work with allies within trade unions, NGOs and campaign groups to this end.
3. To support and call localised days of action on campuses throughout the year to co-ordinate the fight against tuition fees, austerity cuts and a marketised education system.
4. To call a national demonstration to end austerity and for free education in the Autumn term.

426 words

Motion to HE Zone

1663 (c) Bad organisation and management makes for a bad student experience

Proposer: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Seconder: Dan Wrigglesworth (LGBT+ Officer)

Conference Believes

1. In the NSS, the "organisation and management" category comes out as a consistent concern for students.
2. O&M on a course underpins the entire academic experience – it directly affects students' ability to learn.
3. Problems with organisation and management are stressful and distracting for students.
4. Conversely, when a course is well organised and running smoothly, students can concentrate on their studies rather than having to focus time and energy on administrative issues.

5. High-quality organisation and management facilitates positive relationships between staff and students by eliminating unnecessary points of conflict and dissatisfaction.
6. Good organisation and management promotes widening participation.

Conference Further Believes

1. The choice to study part-time or to enter higher education as a mature student or a student with caring responsibilities is often determined by factors such as a timetable that is amenable to balancing study with other responsibilities.
2. Other issues like placements and assessment “spacing” all impact on the student experience. Too often these decisions are reached without input from students and with the needs of the institution, not students, at the forefront.

Conference Resolves

1. Student officers and reps need advice and support on the issues that directly matter to students.
2. O&M is an area where guidance and bargaining support from NUS on good practice can enable reps and officers to campaigns for a real difference that will directly impact on students.
3. This is the sort of thing that trade unions do all the time on issues, terms and conditions impacting on workers- it is the sort of thing NUS should do on educational issues.
4. To mandate the VP Higher Education to develop bargaining resources for SU officers and reps on organisation and management issues in 15/16.
5. To commit to researching and issuing a wider, regular programme of bargaining resources and to monitor wins that unions have when using them.

Word Count: 307

1663 (d) Amendment to 301 “Supporting for Success” Welfare Zone Motion

Proposer: H Staynor (Welfare, Diversity and Community Officer).

Seconder: C Jarvis (Campaigns & Democracy Officer)

Add amendment

Conference Believes

As the demand for Student support services increase, institutions should review resourcing annually to ensure that advertised services are delivered and that student expectations are met.

Institutions should ensure the full complement of services is offered throughout the year including vacation periods.

Conference Resolves

To call on institutions to ensure that staff who manage appeals and complaint procedures are aware of how the provision of support services can be the vital lifeline for many students.

To call on institutions to conduct a detailed analysis of support service usage and relate it to access and retention.

To call on institutions to commit to ensuring that financial support lost when the Access to Learning Fund was scrapped are replaced by the institution and that allocation criteria are open and transparent, ensuring that Union officers are be part of the review of how funds are spent each year.

Word Count 143

1668 Dodgy Sugar in my Dodgy Coffee (Starbucks and Tate & Lyle Boycott) passed 12 February 2015

Proposer: Sam Jones (PSI 2nd Year) (Kinversam@hotmail.com)
Secunder: Yan Malinowski (Liberal Democrats)

This Union Notes:

1. Starbucks paid just £8.6m in corporation tax in the UK over 14 years and nothing in the last four years - despite sales of £400m last year. Total Starbucks sales in the UK amounted to £3 Bn since 2000, resulting in an effective corporation tax rate of 0.286%
2. Tate & Lyle Sugar Group declared £379m profit from their UK sales figures in 2013, but £0 in profits from their UK arm, giving an effective 0% corporation tax rate.
3. A Tate & Lyle Executive has stated that 'Tate & Lyle has minimal revenue-generating operations in the UK'
4. The standard UK corporation tax rate on profits over £300,000 is 21%.
5. While Starbucks is currently banned from advertising within Union House or the Union itself, the union shop currently stocks pre-packaged Starbucks iced coffee drinks.
6. Tate and Lyle Granulated Sugar, Icing Sugar and Demerara Sugar are currently sold in the Union Shop.
7. That the issue of tax avoidance by corporations and rich individuals has become a major political issue since 2010, and that tax avoidance by corporations has been estimated at £4.1bn by the Treasury and at up to £12bn by campaigners.

8. That the UK government is using lack of tax revenue as a reason to cut public Services, including tripling tuition fees to £9,000 in 2012.

9. That Policy 1436 already resolves to refuse to 'host, any branch of', 'refuse advertising space to' or refuse 'access to Union House or other union-owned premises' to any companies that engage in tax avoidance or evasion (Resolves 1,2 and 3, Policy 1436, November 2013).

This Union Believes:

1. That tax avoidance is immoral as it deprives the state of democratically set revenue that could be used to fund higher education, the National Health Service, emergency services and other public services.

2. That companies who promote or engage in tax avoidance or evasion are engaging in an immoral practice.

3. That public pressure has already contributed to making tax avoidance a major political issue, convincing companies to address their avoidance and government to focus more on the issue. However, in this case the government's action so far does not go nearly far enough to address the issue, and so the need for public pressure remains.

4. That we must wholeheartedly condemn tax avoidance/evasion, and endeavour to use alternative services and products where reasonable, and aim not to contribute the profits of such companies whenever feasible.

The Union Resolves:

1. To remove all Starbucks products from the Union Shop and any other Union sales and services, once existing stocks have been sold, and find alternative products if necessary at the discretion of staff.

2. To remove all Tate & Lyle products from the Union shop and from any other Union sales and services, once existing stocks have been sold, and replace with products from the co-op, or any other appropriate replacement, at the discretion of staff.

3. To mandate the Campaigns and Democracy officer and/or the Ethical Issues officer to publicise the withdrawal of these products at a university and wider level, in order to increase public pressure on such companies to comply with the spirit, as well as the technicalities of UK tax law, and pay reasonable amounts of tax on the profits they make in the UK.

1669 (a) Reduction of Taught Programme Modules passed 12 Feb 15

Proposer: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer)

Seconder: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Union Notes

1. Learning and Teaching Committee recently approved a policy that seeks to reduce the number of taught modules with less than a specified number of students enrolled.
2. The number of students that are specified for a module to be 'financially viable' is 10.
3. That many existing courses, particularly at PGT level, contain modules with fewer than 10 students.
4. That the specified number for 'financially viable' modules applies to all schools at all levels, regardless of the number of students in that school or the variation in cost for running individual modules.

Union Believes

1. The reduction in modules to only the most popular will lead to a more homogenised selection of modules available.
2. Many students value choice in modules, and the ability to specialise in niche or specialist subject areas.
3. That any calculation of what is 'viable' for each school should factor in the size of the school, as well as considering if modules are vital to offering a holistic course provision.
4. Reduction in modules for PGT will lead to many courses being slashed.
5. Course programmes should be designed to provide a broad range of options to provide rounded education, and not dictated by the market.
6. This policy is a direct consequence of the government drive to marketise the higher education sector, with the outcome being an educational system based on the needs of the market or 'financially viable', rather than providing education for its own sake.

Union Resolves

1. To request that the university review the procedures with reference to the above points.
2. To ensure that where modules are closed, that it is done through proper evidencing and with extensive student consultation.
3. To demand the university put in place adequate measures to ensure that students on modules due to be closed are protected and that they are not adversely affected.

Proposer: Chris Jarvis (Campaigns & Democracy Officer)

Seconder: Holly Staynor (Welfare, Diversity and Community Officer)

Union Notes:

1. Our current election rules have not been updated for a long time.
2. The election rules at present are particularly rigid and offer little flexibility or interpretation for a DRO or RO.
3. Some of the rules listed are no longer fit for purpose – e.g. we no longer use a physical ballot paper for voting.
4. Our constitution and byelaws are at present burdensome and lengthy, and are not easily accessible documents for most students to use.

Union Believes:

1. The lack of room for interpretation from a DRO and RO in the election rules make for a less effective, accessible election process.
2. Strict election rules being laid out in the constitution and byelaws are unnecessary as this can be compensated for by effective candidate training and are more readily amended by a Deputy Returning Officer from year to year based on what works and what does not.
3. That having rules related to election processes that are no longer used by the organisation and are anachronistic (such as physical ballot papers) does not represent a functioning governing document.
4. Many practices that would be restricted by our existing electoral rules are very difficult to police and enforce and therefore open a DRO to substantial challenge from candidates if judgements appear unevenly spread.
5. Slimming down the governing documents, while not removing their efficacy is an important step in making the internal practices of UUEAS more accessible to more students.

Union Resolves:

1. To delete byelaws 4.1 to 4.41 and replace with the following, renumbering accordingly:

Bye-Law 4: Election Regulations Pursuant to the Constitution

These are the rules governing the election of Student Officers, Equal Opportunities Officers, Course Representatives, Union Council Representatives and delegates to the NUS National Conference.

Rules governing the election of Student Officers and the NUS National Conference Delegates.

Returning Officer

4.1 The Returning Officer shall be a suitably qualified person external to the University of East Anglia, appointed by the Board of Trustees of the Union of UEA Students and formally approved by the University Registrar. The Returning Officer shall be ultimately responsible for the election.

4.2 The Returning Officer shall monitor the actions of the Deputy Returning Officer, who shall be appointed by the Student Officer Committee and cannot be an ordinary member of the Union, for each election, and will determine any complaint relating to the conduct of the election where appropriate.

4.3 The Returning Officer, and the Deputy Returning Officer, shall undertake any duties necessary to ensure the fair and proper conduct of the elections.

4.4 The Returning Officer shall publish a list of any election rules or interpretations and the timeline for each election in advance of the election taking place having taken advice from the Deputy Returning Officer and the Democratic Procedures Committee.

4.5 The Returning Officer has executive responsibility for interrupting the election regulations and other bye-laws which may impact on the election. They will not normally have "day-to-day" interaction with candidates however retain powers to intervene in the election alongside acting as the final route of appeal for candidates.

4.6 The Deputy Returning Officer will have the delegated powers from the Returning Officer to issue rulings and warning to those taking part in the election in relation to the election regulations and other bye-laws.

4.7 The Deputy Returning Officer shall be responsible for ensuring there is support and guidance provided to candidates and potential candidates wishing to take part in the elections. The details of this support and guidance should be advertised in advance of the election period.

4.8 During the course of the election period additional support may be called on to ensure elections are well run and administered correctly. The Returning Officer and Deputy Returning Officer have the discretion to introduce other election officials to provide this.

Principles of a Union of UEA Students Election and Rules

4.9 All elections taking place at the Union of UEA Students shall be: fair and open, democratic, accessible and transparent.

4.10 A timetable for the election period will be set out by the Deputy Returning Officer, on advice from the Student Officer Committee and Democratic Procedures Committee and made available to members in advance of the election period. All voting figures will be published in good time after the election closes.

4.11 The Returning Officer and the Deputy Returning Officer will publish election campaigning rules, on advice from the Student Officer Committee and Democratic Procedures Committee, that adhere to these principles in advance of the close of nominations for an election.

4.12 It is the role of the Returning Officer, and Deputy Returning Officer, to ensure these principles and the subsequently adopted rules are upheld. Where it is felt that these adopted rules are not being upheld by a candidate the Returning Officer, on advice from their Deputy, make take the following action:

4.12.1 the disqualification of a candidate or candidates from the election

4.12.2 that promotional materials (including but not limited to posters, flyers and online materials) contravening the regulations be removed.

4.12.3 that publicity be displayed at any fixed Union polling stations and online giving details of an infringement,

4.12.4 a re-election, starting the election process at any stage

4.12.5 a re-vote, which shall mean all the election stages which follow completion of nominations, and shall not include the reopening of nominations

4.12.6 the non-payment of a campaign expenses claim

4.13 The Deputy Returning Officer has the power, devolved from the Returning Officer, to issue warnings to candidates in the election and should set out in these warnings the action which shall follow if they are not heeded which could be any of the above.

4.14 The Deputy Returning Officer has the power, devolved from the Returning Officer, to suspend a candidate from the election pending the outcome of an investigation into an alleged breach of rules. During this period, the candidate is not permitted to actively campaign or discuss publicly the reasons for their suspension.

4.15 In a Referendum, there shall be boxes for "Votes For", "Votes Against" and "Abstention"

4.16 The Question for the Referendum shall be determined by the body that calls the referendum, as outlined in Bye-Law 1.3, subject to its approval by Management Committee who shall rule on the wording, being careful to avoid loaded questions. In the case of a petition, students should propose a question for Management Committee's approval before the petition is launched.

4.17 These principles and rules will be kept under review to enable and maximise participation in elections and measures to restrict activity of candidates and campaigns to ensure fairness, and to this effect the Deputy Returning Officer will make recommendations in their Annual Report to the Union Council on adaptations.

Standing in the Election and Campaigning

4.18 Members wishing to stand as a candidate in any election will be required to complete and supply to the Deputy Returning Officer all relevant nomination material in advance of the close of nominations.

4.19 Where possible manifestos or their equivalent will be promoted via student media. It is the responsibility of the Deputy Returning Officer to organise this and no individual candidate should attempt to promote themselves in any Union run student media.

4.20 An opportunity will be provided to members to ask question to the candidates standing in the election. The rules for taking part in this will be developed by the Deputy Returning Officer and made available to candidates in advance of the event.

4.21 Candidates accept any terms and conditions of employment relating to the post at the point of nomination by completing the relevant nomination form.

4.22 Any candidate may withdraw their nomination by informing the Deputy Returning Officer and the Returning Officer, in writing, at any point.

4.23 Whereas candidates may well adopt similar policy stances and use similar publicity materials to other candidates, no candidate shall use publicity to promote another candidate, in the same or other election.

4.24 Should any member have objections regarding the eligibility of any candidates these should be made in writing to the Deputy Returning Officer in advance of the voting period opening.

The Ballot Paper

4.25 In any election where there are any nominations the ballot paper shall include the statement "Re-open Nominations" (RON). RON will be treated like any other candidate and as such will have a campaign budget equal to the other candidates, will have their votes counted in the same manner and will fall under the same disciplinary actions as the other candidates. If at any stage of the count RON candidate gains the required number of votes to be elected, it shall be deemed to have been elected and any surplus and any further votes, transferred to a further RON candidate. This stage shall be repeated as often as required. The returning officer shall declare unfilled the number of vacancies equal to the number of 're-open nominations' candidates deemed to have been elected, if any.

Voting

4.26 Votes shall be cast by Single Transferable Vote.

4.27 Candidates and their representatives shall not attempt to bully or intimidate a member into voting for a particular candidate or preference. As such, they must not approach any member who in the process of casting their vote.

Complaints and Results

4.28 Any complaint on the conduct of the election or of any violation of these Regulations must be made in writing to the Deputy Returning Officer prior to the count, except where the complaint relates to the conduct of the count itself. If the complainant is dissatisfied with the resolution of the Deputy Returning Officer, or the Deputy Returning Officer is the subject of the complaint, the complainant may make the complaint in writing to the Returning Officer whose ruling shall be final.

4.29 All election results shall be reported, by the Deputy Returning Officer to the next meeting of Union Council.

The Count

4.30 The count shall be supervised by the Returning Officer or their nominee

4.31 The Count should be conducted in accordance with rules outlined by the Electoral Reform Society for running elections by Single Transferable Vote.

4.32 Complaints about the count must be made in writing to the Returning Officer no later than one working day after the announcement of the result.

4.33 The results of the election will only come into effect once the Returning Officer has certified that the result is the accurate outcome of a free and fair democratic procedure.

4.34 A count shall only commence once all complaints and appeals about campaigners have been resolved.

4.35 The count should commence only after the Deputy Returning Officer is satisfied that all complaints relating to the conduct and administration of the election have been resolved.

4.36 All election results shall be reported, by the Deputy Returning Officer to the next meeting of Union Council.

1670 Motion to amend policy 1398 (Motion to boycott the sale of 'The Sun' and 'The Daily Star' from Union Outlets, passed 24th October 2013)
passed 12 Feb 15

Proposer – Asia Patel (Norwich Nightline)

Seconder – Chris Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy Officer)

Union Notes:

1. That policy 1398 covers details regarding The Sun but not the Daily Star.
2. That the Daily Star also publishes daily photos of topless women on their page three and their newspaper content is very similar to that of The Sun.

Union Believes:

1. That UUEAS should not be selective when applying policies to the union outlets.
2. That the Daily Star is as problematic as the Sun and should be treated the same.

Union Resolves:

1. To change Union Notes 1 to read "That UUEAS outlets stock newspapers like The Sun and The Daily Star. These newspapers publish daily photos of topless young women."
2. To add a Union Notes 3 which reads "That studies have shown links between viewing sexualised images, images objectifying women and normalising aggressive behaviours (*Government-Commissioned Sexualisation of Young People Review*, Dr Linda Papadopoulou, Feb 2010). Other studies have shown that rape myths and beliefs which condone violence are more accepted by young adults who are exposed to sexualised and objectifying content (Kalof, 1999; Lanis and Covell, 1995; Milburn *et al.*, 2000; Ward, 2002)."
3. To change Union Notes 4 to read "That figures range from 30,000 women being sexually assaulted and 60,000 raped each year to 1 in 4 who have been sexually assaulted."
4. To add section under Union Notes (section 5 under the amended motion) which reads "That UUEAS has a zero-tolerance against sexual harassment and sexual assault."
5. To add a Union Notes 6 which reads "That the Never Okay campaign and the Sexual Assault Awareness Campaign (SAAC) are currently active and trying to stop cases of sexual assault/harassment."
6. To change Union Notes 7 to read "That the Sun and The Daily Star often post controversial headlines perpetuating the oppression of mentally ill, disabled, and LGBT+ people, and ethnic minorities, such as in 7th October's headline '1,000 Killed by Mental Patients' (<http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/5183994/1200>, The Sun) or The Daily Star's 'Muslim thugs aged just 12 in knife attack on Brit school boy' of 18th November 2010."
7. To change Union Notes 8 to read "Other Students' Unions including Leeds Metropolitan, Nottingham and Bradford have decided to withdraw the sale of the Sun and the Daily Star in their own outlets."
8. To add in a section under Union Believes (section 1 under the amended motion) which reads "That sexualised images belong in their rightful place such as pornography, and not in newspapers."
9. To change Union Believes 2 to read "Stocking 'The Sun and The Daily Star' is contrary to UUEAS aims of upholding values of equality for all, and of

- zero tolerance of sexual harassment and sexual assault in conjunction with the currently occurring campaigns.”
10. To add in a section under Union Believes (section 3 under the amended motion) which reads “That women are unequally represented in the Sun and in the Daily Star with their worth based on their appearance whereas men are reported based on their achievements.”
 11. To change Union Believes 5 to read “That The Sun and The Daily Star have accompanying context and content which could be considered as humiliating. Namely the patronising ‘news in brief section’ which openly mocks the idea that an attractive women may for example read Nietzsche or have whatever intellectual pursuits that the reporters choose to juxtapose against the image on that day. Additionally these images are the largest representation of a women in the 60 pages of The Sun.”
 12. To change Union Notes 6 to be Union Believes 6.
 13. To change Union Resolves 1 to read “UEA should follow other universities and end the sale of The Sun and The Daily Star newspapers in UEA shops in support of gender equality.”
 14. To change Union Resolves 2 to read “To inform News International and the Editor of the Sun and of the Daily Star of this policy.”

1398 Motion to boycott the sale of ‘The Sun’ and ‘The Daily Star’ from Union Outlets (with amendments) Passed 24 October 13

Proposer – Rachel Knott (Women’s Officer)

Secunder – Louisa Kennard (Feminist Society)

Union Notes:

15. That UUEAS outlets stock newspapers like The Sun and The Daily Star. These newspapers publish daily photos of topless young women.
16. That UUEAS seeks to uphold the values of equality and diversity of its members.
17. That studies have shown links between viewing sexualised images, images objectifying women and normalising aggressive behaviours (*Government-Commissioned Sexualisation of Young People Review*, Dr Linda Papadopoulos, Feb 2010)^[1]. Other studies have shown that rape myths and beliefs which condone violence are more accepted by young adults who are exposed to sexualised and objectifying content (Kalof, 1999; Lanis and Covell, 1995; Milburn *et al.*, 2000; Ward, 2002)^[2].
18. That figures range from 30,000 women being sexually assaulted and 60,000 raped each year to 1 in 4 who have been sexually assaulted.
19. That UUEAS has a zero-tolerance against sexual harassment and sexual assault.

20. That the Never Okay campaign and the Sexual Assault Awareness Campaign (SAAC) are currently active and trying to stop cases of sexual assault/harassment.
21. That the Sun and The Daily Star often post controversial headlines perpetuating the oppression of mentally ill, disabled, and LGBT+ people, and ethnic minorities, such as in 7th October's headline '1,000 Killed by Mental Patients' (<http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/5183994/1200>, The Sun) or The Daily Star's 'Muslim thugs aged just 12 in knife attack on Brit school boy' of 18th November 2010.
22. Other Students' Unions including Leeds Metropolitan, Nottingham and Bradford have decided to withdraw the sale of the Sun and the Daily Star in their own outlets.

Union Believes:

1. That sexualised images belong in their rightful place such as pornography, and not in newspapers.
2. Stocking 'The Sun and The Daily Star' is contrary to UUEAS aims of upholding values of equality for all, and of zero tolerance of sexual harassment and sexual assault in conjunction with the currently occurring campaigns.
3. That women are unequally represented in the Sun and in the Daily Star with their worth based on their appearance whereas men are reported based on their achievements.
4. Action taken in collaboration with other Students' Unions and campaign groups is an effective method of affecting change in institutions.
5. That The Sun and The Daily Star have accompanying context and content which could be considered as humiliating. Namely the patronising 'news in brief section' which openly mocks the idea that an attractive women may for example read Nietzsche or have whatever intellectual pursuits that the reporters choose to juxtapose against the image on that day. Additionally these images are the largest representation of a women in the 60 pages of The Sun.
6. That many UUEAS' members believe features like The Sun's Page Three promotes a racist conception of beauty. In the 42 years that page three has been running, there have only been four black women featured.

Union Resolves:

1. UEA should follow other universities and end the sale of The Sun and The Daily Star newspapers in UEA shops in support of gender equality.
2. To inform News International and the Editor of the Sun and of the Daily Star of this policy.

Endnotes:

[1] <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/10738/1/sexualisation-young-people.pdf>

[2]

<http://www.wondercatdesign.com/mecasa/images/pdfs/harms%20of%20porn%20exposure-%202009.pdf>

1671 'No More Nukes' – Support the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament passed 12 Feb 15

Proposer: Josh Wilson, Ethical Issues Officer

Seconder: Holly Staynor, Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer

Union notes that:

1. The British government intends to replace Trident, its current nuclear weapons system.
2. Estimates for the cost of a replacement over its 30 year lifespan are in excess of £100 billion.¹
3. Public opinion remains consistently against the replacement of Britain's nuclear weapons², while senior military figures say that it is 'completely useless' in modern warfare³.
4. The recent economic crisis has prompted massive cuts to public spending, with tuition fees lifted to £9000 and 1 in 10 libraries closing⁴. Meanwhile, the number of people using food banks has tripled over the past year alone⁵.
5. A single Trident missile is capable of delivering a payload of 100 megatons, in excess of 5 times more powerful than the bomb that killed at least 100,000 at Hiroshima.
6. The UK is a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT); replacing the Trident system would be in direct contravention of the obligations established under it.

Union believes that:

¹<http://www.cnduk.org/campaigns/no-to-trident>

²<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1286199/David-Cameron-told-Heres-37bn-cuts-started.html>

³<http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2009/jan/16/trident-is-20bn-waste-say-generals>

⁴<http://www.voicesforthelibrary.org.uk/campaigns/10-things-you-need-to-know-about-library-closurescampaigns/>

⁵<http://www.trusselltrust.org/stats>

1. At a time of widespread economic hardship, government spending should not prioritise a weapon of mass destruction that we cannot afford.
2. The money intended to be spent on Trident could be put to better use, for safeguarding our NHS, abolishing tuition fees, or funding the construction of new, affordable homes.
3. The use of nuclear weapons in any circumstance would be fundamentally wrong, since their only capability is indiscriminate killing of a civilian population and instilling terror.
4. The UK should fulfil its obligations as a signatory to the NPT.

Union resolves to:

1. Maintain an active stance against nuclear weapons and the replacement of Trident.
 2. Support students taking action against nuclear weapons, including facilitating students attending marches and demonstrations.
 3. Publish a statement expressing this.
 4. Become a signatory to Rethink Trident, calling on the government to cancel Trident replacement.
-

1672 Quality Assurance Agency Student Submission passed 12 Feb 15

Proposer: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Seconder: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer)

Council notes

1. That in October 2015 UEA is to be reviewed by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA).
2. That QAA reviews occur approximately every six years.
3. That as part of the review, the Union have been asked to prepare a Student Submission which sets out student views on the quality of the university's education.

Council believes

1. That the Student Submission offers an opportunity to improve the quality of students' education at UEA.
2. That the Student Submission should be representative of the views and experiences of all UEA students.

Council resolves

1. To mandate the UG Education Officer and the PG Education Officer to carry out consultation with UEA students as part of the preparation of the Student Submission.
2. That the Student Submission be submitted to Council for comment prior to its submission to the QAA.

1673 Merged schools passed 12 Feb 15

Proposer: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Seconder: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer)

Union Notes:

1. That on August 1st UEA restructured some of its schools to form three 'Super Schools'.
2. That the Students' Union has produced a paper outlining the problems of the school merger.

Union Believes:

1. That students in these merged schools have had their experience disrupted by administrative changes.
2. That student representation in these schools has been disrupted due to changes to the SSLCs.
3. That students were assured that this merger would not affect their student experience and this has not been the case.
4. That the University should continue to work with the Students' Union and Student Reps to ensure a smooth transition during any administrative changes.

Union Resolves:

1. To continue to work with the University to ensure the experience in merged schools is of a high standard.
2. To ensure that the University consults UUEAS fully in any future large administrative changes.

3. To review the merged schools in light of the merged school report at the end of the 2014/15 academic year to ensure the student experience has been restored.

1674 Fair Trade University passed 12 Feb 15

Proposer: Josh Wilson (Ethical Issues Officer)

Seconder: Frith Dunkley (UEA Young Greens Society)

Union Notes

1. Fair Trade fortnight begins on the 23rd February.
2. Fair Trade is a certification given to goods by the Fair Trade Foundation which has a variety of minimum standards required in areas such as the treatment and pay of hired labour and trading price.
3. The Fair Trade Foundation aims to secure a more sustainable and equitable pricing systems for all those involved in global supply chains of various goods. With the goal of reducing the risk of those involved in these supply chains from falling into poverty.
4. Universities are also able to gain the Fair Trade University accreditation by stocking as many Fair Trade products as possible, promoting Fair Trade to their students and both the Student Union and University having a Fair Trade policy.
5. In the Green League produced by People and Planet released recently UEA scored 0% on sections related to Fair Trade.

Union Believes

1. Fair Trade makes a positive impact to people around the globe.
2. The Union should support the Fair Trade Foundation in its goals.

Union Resolves

1. To stock Fair Trade alternatives to products where possible in all Union outlets.
 2. To ensure all clothing procured by the Union is Fair Trade.
 3. To lobby the University to also adopt a Fair Trade policy.
 4. To work towards getting Fair Trade University accreditation.
-

Management Accounts to January 2015

Representation and Campaigns Budgets

	Spent to	Projected	Full year	Difference
	Date	Spend	Budget	
	£	£	£	£
Student Leadership unit				
Staff Costs - Monthly Salaries	47,174	46,626	100,481	6,681
Staff costs - Weekly wages	5,042	4,500	8,000	(1,542)
Staff costs - Training	1,864	6,000	10,000	2,136
Staff costs - Uniform	584	600	0	(1,184)
Staff costs - Travel/Van	2,052	0	0	(2,052)
Total Staff Costs	56,714	57,726	118,481	4,041
Admin - General expenses	55	0	1,000	945
Total Admin	55	0	1,000	945
Rep'n - Elections and Expenses	0	6,300	7,500	1,200
Rep'n - Conference expenses	2,230	4,000	7,500	1,270
Rep'n - Campaigns	675	2,926	10,000	6,399
Rep'n - Campaigns 2	690	2,241	10,000	7,069
Rep'n - NUS Affiliations	14,804	15,000	30,000	197
Total Representation	18,398	30,467	65,000	16,135
	75,167	88,193	184,481	21,121