

Policy passed by Union Council 3 December 2015

Index

<u>1812 Hepatitis C Awareness.....</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>1814 Provide the correct on campus facilities for Pool and Snooker Club</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>1815 Guarantor Scheme</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>1816 SWP off our campus</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>1818 Response to the HE Green Paper</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>1819 Nothing Rhymes With Orange</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>1820 Amendment to the Bye-Laws: Part-Time Trans and Non-Binary Officer</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>1821 NUS lead delegate – let’s improve our democracy</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>1823 Support HSC Students – keep the National Health Service bursary</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>Emergency Resolution – Don’t Bomb Syria</u>	<u>20</u>

1812 Hepatitis C Awareness

passed 3 December 15

Proposer: Louise Rudd (Postgraduate SU Committee)

Seconder: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer)

Union Notes:

1. A campaign called "Going Viral" found that hepatitis C prevalence figures for the tested population were 4.5 times higher than the reported prevalence for hepatitis C for the UK and six times the national average in the in 25-55 year age group.
2. Hepatitis C is a blood born virus which remains active in blood outside the body for several weeks, therefore it can be transmitted through sharing personal items such as tooth brushes or razors, through intra nasal drug use as well as intravenous drug use, tattooing and piercing and through medical treatment carried out in developing countries.
3. Up to 500,000 people in the UK have Hepatitis C, but only about 20% have been diagnosed.
4. There is no vaccine, but there is effective treatment available. The sooner it is treated the better the outcome.
5. Left untreated Hepatitis C can cause liver fibrosis, cirrhosis and cancer. ¹

Union Believes:

1. Hepatitis C is a hidden epidemic that, because of its links to drug use, remains taboo.
2. The various means of catching the virus, and the lack of knowledge about it means that the virus is a potential hidden threat to the student population.
3. Knowledge is power. This life threatening virus can be cured so testing it vital for anyone who thinks they may have been exposed to it.
4. Prevention is better than the cure. Students need to be taught how to keep themselves safe from the virus.
5. That we have a responsibility to inform all students about Hepatitis C.

Union Resolves:

1. To mandate the Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer to run a Hepatitis C awareness campaign across campus and for the Union to publicise the dangers of Hepatitis C and the treatments available to students on an ongoing basis.

¹ <http://www.hepctrust.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/Are%20you%20at%20risk%20leaflet%20-%20June%202011.pdf>

1814 Provide the correct on campus facilities for Pool and Snooker club

Passed 3 December 15

Proposer: Thomas Bulley (Pool and Snooker Union representative)

Seconder: Samuel Fletcher (UEA Ballet Union representative)

Union Notes:

1. UEA Pool and Snooker club has held a location on campus housing two snooker tables since the University was established in 1963, this year is the first year in the history of UEA that those facilities have not existed.
2. With the postgraduate area redevelopment plans put in place last year and executed over the summer, the existing snooker room was to be removed, the agreement was that one Snooker table would remain in the postgraduate area, as it would be a main facility of the Pool and Snooker club. The snooker tables would be taken into storage until the new area would be ready to have one installed.
3. On the 8th of September UEA Pool and snooker club received notification that the agreement between the Student Union and the club had fallen through due to miscommunication between Project Management of the new Postgraduate area and our Student Union. Meaning that there would not be any suitable facilities for the club to practise on campus.
4. At the beginning of this academic year the club received notification that the snooker tables could no longer be kept in storage; one had previously been given away to a member of the public and the second has now been destroyed.
5. The recent loss of the facilities for the club members has significantly affected the club financially, and also affected the number of members in the club with a 45% decrease since last year, while also playing standards are affected and club members' morale.
6. With UEA competing in both BUCS team events in Snooker and Pool for the first time in recent years we feel that we have been affected by the loss of our facilities. Our teams can now not practise on campus and are forced instead to head off campus to practise at a third party facility.
7. The club currently has the BUCS England captain representing the university at Snooker Home nations (England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland universities play each other with a winner announced after two days of play) for the next two years and has lost the facilities to train and coach our members – with another member that could potentially be representing England in the foreseeable future.
8. Last year the facilities offered an opportunity for female players to try our sport away from an alcohol drinking environment, something that they had identified as key to their involvement.

9. Our weekly practise session has decreased dramatically in the form of participation because of the state of Pool tables that are in the bar, the lack of room that the tables are positioned in also hinders playing.

Union Believes:

1. The ability of the club to engage with students on campus has decreased dramatically from the loss of the clubs facilities.
2. Our loss of members has greatly reduced the likelihood of full and effective representation of UEA at both Pool and Snooker BUCS championships in future years.
3. The club has lost the chance to provide participation opportunities to existing and potential members, via competitive practice standards on campus.
4. The club has lost a key opportunity to inspire new members through coaching by our highest standard player ever to represent UEA. Something that was used last year to help inspire our women's and men's teams.
5. The loss of our facilities has impacted on the ability of the club to provide to a diverse audience with regard to gender. Last year UEA having its first ever Women's pool team, this year that team has already suffered a loss because of facilities and to have another Women's team is something that is in the balance to make another team this year.
6. With the loss of such a vital facility, it is very hard to see a positive future for the club, with a disproportionate amount of members this year who are from the previous year.

Union Resolves:

1. To support the club in finding a suitable room and location to provide the club with similar facilities that had previously existed.
2. Ensure that the location that would be provided would be safe from such events that have previously happened, if something similar was to happen then the club would receive a similar location to continue the club.

1815 Guarantor Scheme passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Theo Antoniou-Phillips (LGBT+ Officer)

Secunder: Ting Ni (International Students Officer)

Union notes:

1. To secure a tenancy in the private sector as a student, landlords and letting agents are increasingly including requirements that student tenants must have a UK based guarantor.
 2. For someone to act as a guarantor they must fill certain criteria, although this can vary. They must be UK based, earn over a stipulated amount per year and/or pass a credit check.²
 3. International students and LGBT+ students who are estranged from their families are faced with additional barriers of securing a property due to the difficulty in finding a suitable guarantor.
 4. The government scrapping of the housing benefit for 18-21 year olds has adversely affected LGBT+ young people as they cannot always rely on their parents/guardians to accept their identity leading to family estrangement. In extreme cases this leads to youth homelessness, and according to the Albert Kennedy Trust a quarter of the UK's homeless youth are LGBT+³.
 5. Due to the Immigration Bill, which was enacted on the 14th of May⁴, requiring landlords to check the Visa status of any international tenants, there is less incentive for landlords or letting agencies to relax guarantor restrictions to accept an international student tenant.
- 5(a) That the government refusal to remove international students from the target net migration figures has meant that their unfair targeting of immigrants has also unfairly hit international students. International students already face additional financial pressure due to the introduction of NHS 'health surcharge'⁵ and higher tuition fees.
6. Some international students that are unable to find a UK based guarantor are often requested to pay for 6 months rent up front.
 7. There are external companies who can act as a guarantor to student tenants, such as Housing Hand⁶. This company requires the equivalent of

² <http://www.leaders.co.uk/pages/tenants-faq#q3>

³ <http://www.akt.org.uk/2/spg545/albert-kennedy-trust-helping-young-lgbt-people/can-you-help/youth-homelessness-matters-day.aspx>

⁴ <http://services.parliament.uk/bills/2013-14/immigration.html>

⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-introduces-health-surcharge>

⁶ <http://www.housinghand.co.uk/>

one month's rent as payment for use of their service. If, at the end of the tenancy, the student has not defaulted or is not in arrears they receive 20% of this sum back.

8. That the University of East Anglia continues to increase the cost of on-campus accommodation, meaning some students are priced out of student halls. This means that returning students that struggle to find a guarantor cannot afford to fall back on University accommodation.
9. There are a number of universities that have responded to the needs of international students and LGBT+ students who are estranged from their families. These include: Cardiff University⁷, Edinburgh University⁸, Goldsmiths University⁹, UCL¹⁰ and York University¹¹.
10. UCL has had a guarantor scheme running for fifteen years guaranteeing rent for, on average, 180 students a year. A £50 administrative fee is charged to the students requiring the service, which is capped to mitigate risk. Only two students have failed to reimburse the University after a rent default during the 15 years that the scheme has been running, ultimately meaning the scheme has been profitable for UCL.

Union believes:

1. That every student has the right to affordable and accessible housing during their time at university regardless of their family situation, economic background or student status.
2. That risk of a guarantor scheme can be mitigated with consideration for:
 - a. a mandatory budget training session for students through AdviceSU of the Dean of Students;
 - b. a maximum rental figure set;
 - c. restricting the scheme to returning students only (non-final years);
 - d. requiring a reference from previous landlords
 - e. the guarantee to be restricted to the fixed term of the agreement and to be used exclusively for rent.

⁷ <http://blogs.cardiff.ac.uk/studentlifecu/guarantor-scheme-for-care-leavers-and-estranged-students/>

⁸ <https://eusavps.wordpress.com/2014/11/07/rent-guarantor-scheme-pilot-not-just-a-flight-of-fancy/>

⁹ <http://www.gold.ac.uk/student-services/guarantor/>

¹⁰ <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/medphys/prospective-students/international/living>

¹¹ <https://www.york.ac.uk/students/housing-and-money/accom-help/guarantee-scheme/>

Union resolves:

1. To lobby the University to find more effective ways of informing international students and LGBT+ students who are estranged from their families on housing and guarantor issues.
2. To lobby the University to investigate running a pilot guarantor scheme for students who fail to meet the criteria for a guarantor through private landlords and letting agencies.
3. To ensure that AdviceSU is well equipped to offer practical advice to students who struggle to find guarantors, including but not limited to, the offer of external companies that provide guarantor service until the University agrees to the guarantor scheme.

1816 SWP off our campus passed 3 December 2015

Proposed by Charlotte Earney (Postgraduate Assembly)

Seconded by Juliet Donaghy (HSC Year 1)

Amendments from: L McCafferty (PG Education Officer)

The Union notes:

1. The Socialist Workers' Party (SWP) have had numerous allegations raised that they have a systematic problem of rape, rape cover-up, and rape apologism in their party.
2. The SWP frequently sell their newspaper on campus, both in the square and outside some political events on campus, for example the Norfolk and Suffolk Mental Health Services Campaign held in LT1 recently.
3. The NUS and our union is conducting multiple campaigns around the prevention and safety of sexual assault survivors, such as Never Ok and Stand By Me.

The Students' Union Believes

1. The Union should take a stand against organisations that make survivors feel unsafe on campus
2. The 'Socialist Worker', the official newspaper of the SWP, should not be sold on campus, as its content is highly troubling and upsetting.

The Students' Union Resolves

1. To mandate the Student Officer Committee to write a letter of condemnation to the Central Committee of the SWP and the Norwich SWP branch, expressing in strongest terms our dismay with how the above allegations were handled, and to demand that the organisation disassociate itself from the individuals involved.
 2. To ensure that all publicity distributed by external organisations at union-supported events is in line with our beliefs and values, and to ensure that those distributing materials are not doing so in a manner that is alarming/distressing to students.
-

1818 Response to the HE Green Paper passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Philippa Costello (Non-Portfolio Officer)

Seconder: Liam McCafferty (Postgraduate Education Officer)

Union Notes:

1. The government recently released its 'Fulfilling our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice' green paper, outlining its plans for the future of Higher Education in the UK.
2. The government's recent Comprehensive Spending Review also contains plans to retroactively change student loan conditions to "raid the paychecks" of graduates on low and middle incomes.
3. That National Campaign against Fees and Cuts (NCAFC) has claimed that combined reforms of the HE Green paper and the Comprehensive Spending Review amount to 'full marketisation', and completely devastate and undermine the principle of publicly funded education.¹²
4. The key proposals in the HE Green paper are as follows:
 - a) Teaching Excellence Framework: The paper outlines plans to introduce a TEF, which includes an inflationary rise in fees for those passing "TEF 1". In Year 2, higher levels be introduced and financial incentives differentiated according to the levels. Future tuition fee rises could be imposed by ministers without a vote in Parliament, opening the door to unlimited, unaccountable fee rises.
 - b) The Office for Students: HEFCE & OFFA are to be merged to create a new body that will be in the interest of students.
 - c) Widening Participation: There will be additional targets for widening participation and a new Social Mobility Advisory Group.
 - d) Private Providers: A private provider could get degree awarding powers in less than four years and university status in less than five.
 - e) Student protections: There will be increased protections for students if a course or institution fails.
 - f) Students' unions: A question is asked about how we can improved our transparency and accountability.
 - g) Sharia compliant loans: After years of joint work between NUS and FOSIS, the government are introducing Sharia compliant loans.
 - h) Research: HEFCE will no longer allocate research funding and the research councils are to be reformed.

¹² <http://www.independent.co.uk/student/news/national-campaign-against-fees-and-cuts-urges-students-to-save-education-by-demonstrating-following-a6749026.html>

5. That the government has already announced plans to convert the maintenance grant package into a means-tested loan scheme.
6. The government has already removed the cap on student numbers, generating competition amongst institutions for a limited number of students.
7. That the union has existing policy that resolves to campaign against any further marketisation of higher education.¹³

Union Believes:

1. That these reforms represent the final piece in the jigsaw to implement of a fully, marketised system to Higher Education in the UK.
2. That students should be partners in education, not passive consumers.
3. Access to Higher Education should be based on ability, and not ability to pay.
4. The Teaching Excellence Framework is based upon the Research Excellence Framework, which was described by Peter Scott, Professor of Higher Education Studies at the Institute of Education, as "a Minotaur that must be appeased by bloody sacrifices".
5. That the REF is an unmitigated disaster. It is expensive, ineffective gesture that discourages genuine innovation and restricts academic freedom subjecting research to set of arbitrary metrics aimed at generating competition between institutions.¹⁴
6. The TEF will use employment destination data as a metric for student outcomes. This will, in effect, measure teaching and learning on the basis of what benefits our future employers rather than what is best for us as students.
7. That education should not be subjected to the demands of business. The Green paper mentions 'what employers want' 35 times and 'value for money' 27 times. Students should be able to explore a diverse and intellectually-stimulating curriculum in an environment of academic freedom – instead of one where teaching outcomes are externally imposed and subject to the interests of employers.
8. That quality teaching is often subjective and difficult to measure: and much innovative practice occurs at the grassroots level. Introducing a national framework threatens to strangle pedagogical innovation where it occurs.
9. The TEF will estrange students from academics, and further encourage students to engage with education as 'value for money' and to put

¹³ 1605 No to the Marketisation of Education (The Future of Undergraduate Funding)

¹⁴ <http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2014/dec/15/research-excellence-framework-five-reasons-not-fit-for-purpose>

pressure on already over-worked academics through increased reliance on implementing consumer feedback via the National Student Survey (NSS).

10. That the recent changes to the student maintenance package to a means-tested loan system will already deter many poorer students from attending university. Combined with a tier system for fees as proposed in the TEF, this will make it drastically more difficult for students from widening participation backgrounds to reach those institutions and worsen the BME attainment gap.
11. That the proposed Social Mobility Advisory Group will be largely ineffective in tackling the access issues that will be exacerbated by recent policy changes.
12. That the proposed link to increase in fees will create a two-tier education system, whereby elite institutions are only accessible to those who can afford it.
13. Increased competition for limited student numbers will lead to most institutions focusing on those subjects immediately profitable, which in practice may lead to huge cuts to school and courses amongst middle-ranking institutions.
14. That plans to make it easier for institutions to 'exit' the sector and easier for private providers to enter. This is effectively indicating the planned collapse of our publicly-accountable institutions in favour of those from the private sector.
15. That questions on the transparency and accountability of students' unions is a direct threat to the autonomy and effectiveness of students' unions to represent their members.

Union Resolves:

1. To release a statement responding to the HE Green Paper based upon the beliefs as outlined above.
2. To lobby the Vice-Chancellor to publicly state their concerns as to the consequences of the HE Green paper.
3. To oppose and actively campaign against the implementation of the Teaching Excellence Framework.
4. To oppose any move to further embed graduate attributes, employability, or any other mechanism that attempts to subject learning and teaching outcomes to the needs of employers into course or module design.
5. To request that Norwich South MP, Clive Lewis, write an open letter to the Universities Minister Jo Johnson outlining concerns about the future of HE as outlined in the Green Paper.
6. To convene a working group with the staff unions – UCU, Unison, and Unite – to develop a joint policy document on the green paper and the

state of the sector, addressing key issues such as staff workload and assessment and feedback.

1819 Nothing Rhymes With Orange passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Kate Snape (Students with Disabilities Caucus Physical Disabilities & Mobility Issues Rep)

Seconded: Aaron Hood (Students with Disabilities Officer)

Union Notes

1. Muscular Dystrophy is the umbrella term for muscle wasting conditions
2. 70,000 people or more have Muscular Dystrophy in the UK alone
3. 1 in 1,000 people have Muscular Dystrophy
4. There are students at UEA who have a form of Muscular Dystrophy
5. Muscular Dystrophy UK (MD UK) is a charity that supports people who have these conditions and their families
(<http://www.musculardystrophyuk.org/>)
6. MD UK offers peer support, advice, advocacy and experience
7. The MD UK Trailblazers are a branch of MD UK that conduct studies on common issues for disabled people in the UK and try to combat those issues
8. Trailblazers have conducted studies on Higher Education which have been reported by the BBC (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-29373506>)
9. MD UK is working to improve access to education, opportunities and proper health care for disabled students
10. "Go Orange!" day will take place on 22nd January
(<http://www.musculardystrophyuk.org/events/go-orange/>)
11. MD UK would like people to wear orange for a day
12. They are aiming for 10,000 people to get involved and £10,000 to be raised
13. This is to raise awareness of Muscular Dystrophy and the campaigns Muscular Dystrophy UK are running

Union Believes

1. Students should feel supported at university
2. Young people with disabilities should be able to access Higher Education as easily as other young people
3. That all disabilities should be given parity of esteem by the Union and the University
4. We should be a union that puts effort into supporting all disabilities
5. That muscular dystrophy may not have previously been given the attention it deserves

Union Resolves

1. To assist Chronic in running an awareness campaign on 22nd January 2016
2. To advertise the campaign and get as many students and staff to get involved, wear orange and donate money
3. To assist Chronic in raising money on 22nd January 2016

4. To consult any students with muscular dystrophy about what can be done to improve their university experience
5. To consider any further action that can be taken to raise funds/awareness of muscular dystrophy.

1820 Amendment to the Bye-Laws: Part-Time Trans and Non-Binary Officer passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Elliot Folan (Students with Disabilities Caucus)

Seconder: Theo Antoniou-Philips (LGBT+ Officer)

Union notes:

- 1) That on 17th November, the LGBT+ Caucus endorsed a call from its Trans and Non-Binary Caucus for a part-time officer position to be introduced that would be reserved for transgender and non-binary students;
- 2) That the Union of UEA Students is committed to supporting trans and non-binary rights, as per policy 1740 ("A Transgender and Non-Binary Students Policy for UEA");
- 3) That the above policy commits the SU to supporting the introduction of a reserved Trans Students Officer for the National Union of Students;
- 4) That the position of LGBT+ Officer has only ever been held by a cisgender individual.

Union believes:

- 1) That trans and non-binary students as a Liberation Group deserve their own specific representation within the structures of the Union of UEA Students;
- 2) That this representation should not, however, split trans and non-binary students off from the broader LGBT+ community or movement, as this would weaken the ability of trans and non-binary students to fight for their rights;
- 3) That the LGBT+ Officer role should be split into two positions of "LGBT+ Officer (Open Place)" and "LGBT+ Officer (Transgender and Non-Binary Place)", each with their own vote on SOC;
- 4) That trans and non-binary students are equally capable of representing the interests of cisgender LGBT+ students, and so any reserved position should give them equal authority to an open role.

Union resolves:

- 1) To delete bye-law 4.14 and replace with:

4.14 The LGBT+ Officer (Open Place) shall:

- 4.14.1 Represent the interests of LGBT+ students and be their voice on the issues they face as LGBT+ students at university;
- 4.14.2 Engage with the University and other relevant organisations to achieve improvements for LGBT+ students on the issues they face as LGBT+ students at university;
- 4.14.3 Jointly convene and co-ordinate the Union's LGBT+ Committee;
- 4.14.4 Liaise with the members of the relevant clubs, societies or peer support groups; and
- 4.14.5 Be the Union's delegate to the NUS LGBT Conference.

2) To add new bye-law 4.15 and renumber accordingly:

4.15 The LGBT+ Officer (Transgender and Non-Binary Place) shall:

4.15.1 Represent the interests of LGBT+ students and be their voice on the issues they face as LGBT+ students at university;

4.15.2 Engage with the University and other relevant organisations to achieve improvements for LGBT+ students on the issues they face as LGBT+ students at university;

4.15.3 Jointly convene and co-ordinate the Union's LGBT+ Committee;

4.15.4 Liaise with the members of the relevant clubs, societies or peer support groups; and

4.15.5 Be the Union's Trans Place delegate to the NUS LGBT Conference, as well its delegate to the NUS Transgender Students Conference.

3) To delete bye-law 3.43 and replace with:

3.43 The LGBT+ Caucus shall act as the primary accountability body for the LGBT+ Officer (Open Place) and the LGBT+ Officer (Trans and Non-Binary Place). As such, the LGBT+ Caucus shall have the power to pass motions of censure and commendation in the LGBT+ Officer (Open Place) and the LGBT+ Officer (Trans and Non-Binary Place).

4) To delete bye-law 4.21 and replace with:

4.21 The LGBT+ Officer (Open Place), the LGBT+ Officer (Trans and Non-Binary Place), Women's Officer, Students With Disabilities Officer, Ethnic Minorities Officer, International Students Officer, Mature Students Officer and Postgraduate Officer shall be considered Equal Opportunities Officers and shall be elected by ordinary members who self-define as members of the constituency that the Equal Opportunity Officer represents.

5) To delete bye-law 8.7 and replace with:

8.7 The Equal Opportunities Committee consisting of the Welfare, Community and Diversity Officer, LGBT+ Officer (Open Place), the LGBT+ Officer (Trans and Non-Binary Place), the Students with Disabilities Officer, the Women's Officer, the Ethnic Minorities Officer, the International Officer and the Mature Students Officer along with the member of the Union's Senior Management Team responsible for HR will annually review and make recommendations to update and evaluate the implementation of these regulations.

1821 NUS lead delegate – let's improve our democracy passed 3
December 2015

Proposer: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)
Seconder: Chris Jarvis (Campaigns and Democracy Officer)

Union Notes

1. Each year the National Union of Students holds its annual democratic conference.
2. Like every other union we get to send a delegation of students, the bulk of which is elected by cross-campus ballot.
3. Under NUS' rules one delegate is allowed to be appointed by a Union as the "Delegation leader".
4. Most unions use this to send their President.
5. UEA doesn't have an SU President.
6. UEASU by law 15 states that "One Full-Time Officer, appointed by the Management Committee, may be appointed to the position of lead delegate for NUS National Conference".
7. In 2013 and 2014 this power was delegated to the Student Officer Committee for wider input and involvement.
8. In 2015 Management Committee decided not to do this.
9. Thus the practical application of the current constitutional position has been mixed.

Union Believes

1. Students consistently tell us that they want a more open, transparent and democratic Union and we should be as democratic as possible.
2. That five people deciding who leads our delegation to conference to represent our 15,000 students is profoundly undemocratic.
3. That any member, with appropriate support, can lead our delegation to NUS National Conference and we should be empowering students to play a greater role in both our Union and our national movement.

Union Resolves

1. To mandate the proposer and the Campaigns and Democracy Officer to convene a meeting with current members of the Democratic Procedures Committee to consider alternative ways of electing an NUS lead delegate that is consistent with the above beliefs. The meeting will consider the positives and negatives of several options and bring its conclusions to a meeting of Union Council before the end of the academic year.
-

1823 Support HSC Students – keep the National Health Service bursary

Passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Ruth Stone (UEA Edith Cavell Society)

Seconder: Connor Rand (Undergraduate Education Officer)

Amendments: J Donaghy (HSC YR I UG)

Union Council notes:

1) In 1968, Parliament gave the Secretary of State for Health the power to provide training for people considering employment in the National Health Service (NHS), and to pay allowances to people who have accepted places on these courses. These allowances are known as NHS Bursaries.

2) In the 1990s reforms to nurse education, commonly termed "Project 2000" were implemented, with the academic level of training established at a minimum of a higher education diploma.

3) In the year 2012 all nursing courses became degree level.

4) Allied Health Professions, Midwifery and other Health Science (HSC) courses are also supported by NHS bursaries.

5) The government have now announced that HSC bursaries are to be scrapped and replaced by student loans.

Union Council believes:

1) HSC students should continue to be in receipt of the current NHS bursaries.

2) That future HSC students at UEA would be negatively affected by these changes.

3) That this may lead to other healthcare students having their funding changed in a similar way in the future.

4) That these changes would discourage a large number of potential students from training to become nurses and other healthcare professionals in the future.

Union Council resolves:

1) To mandate the Undergraduate Education Officer to:

- Sign and share the petition to parliament which opposes these changes
- Support UEA student societies in their involvement in the action to oppose these changes
- Publicise the importance of supporting HSC students in their action against these changes
- Encourage all students to individually lobby their home and university MPs in support of keeping the NHS nursing bursary
- To write a statement on behalf of the Union on this issue

- To continue to consult HSC students on action on this issue and provide support where appropriate

Sources:

The Department of Health:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/457030/2015-16_NHS_Bursary_Scheme_New_Rules.pdf

The petition:

<https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/113491>

A brief history of pre-registration nursing education:

http://www.williscommission.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/483286/Preregistration_nurse_education_history.pdf

Emergency Resolution - Don't Bomb Syria passed 3 December 2015

Proposer: Hussam Hussein (Ethnic Minorities Officer – on behalf of BME Caucus)

Seconder: Abbie Mulcairn (Women's Caucus)

Union Notes:

1. Last night parliament approved a government resolution to extend UK airstrikes against 'Islamic State'/ISIS targets in Syria.
2. RAF crews have already begun bombing Syria.

Union Believes:

1. British military interventions in Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya have left those countries in situations much worse than before the interventions.
2. The ongoing bombing of areas controlled by 'ISIS' by a range of countries, has led to many civilian deaths.
3. The political and social instability fomented by these military campaigns has led to the rise of groups like ISIS, and will further perpetuate a climate in which they, and mass political violence, can thrive.
4. There is no transparency regarding any long-term political or military strategy by this government concerning Syria as Britain is opposed to most players engaged in the complicated conflict.
5. Western military interventions have continually betrayed ulterior motives by these governments, as can also be expected of this move by the government to bomb Syria.
6. Bombing Syria is another clear case of the government prioritising warfare when it could be investing in education.
7. During the 2013 Commons vote NEC voted to adopt a stance of having 'no position' on British military intervention against Syria.
8. Such a position is untenable given the impact such a move would have on the political and social situation in the UK and on our membership, particularly international students and refugees.

Union Resolves:

1. To release a statement with immediate effect including the above, condemning the decision to join the bombing of Syria, and expressing our solidarity with the Syrian people.
-