# Publishing Policy Guidance

## Content Review

The Union may need to review a piece of content to ensure that it is abiding by the principles and mitigating the risks outlined in the publishing policy.

This review will be done by a member of staff who will have sufficient training in which to make a decision on the possible legal consequences of publishing said material.

The Union may seek external advice if the appropriate staff member are not able or do not have the knowledge in which to make a decision on the legal implication of content.

It is the duty of the editors to ensure that content is categorised appropriately and this is reviewed by the appropriate staff member regularly. To ensure that proportionality is taken into account, the approach of content reviews will depend on the Risk Rating:

* Low Risk - For all content created by a Student Group rated as Low Risk, the editor should refer any article or publication **of concern or issue** to the appropriate staff member for review before publication. **This will include: event lists, history of pieces, factual pieces.**
* Medium Risk - A defined list of content types along with any highlighted content by the editors will be reviewed before publication. **This list will include, but not limited to; political, opinion, review, satirical and investigatory pieces**. All pieces included in this will be reviewed by the appropriate staff member. Comedy pieces need to be reviewed if they are of a political, satirical, or controversial nature.
* High Risk - All content created by a Student Group rated as High Risk will be reviewed by the appropriate staff member.

**Review Process**

Upon receiving an article or publication for review, the Union will conduct a review to identify if that piece contains any content which could result in the risks outlined above. Each review stage will examine whether any of the risks outlined in this policy have been breached, and therefore the legal implication and if the IPSO code of conduct has been followed effectively.

At each review stage, there are three outcomes which are: (a) Content Approved, (b) Further Approval Needed; or (c) Content Rejected.

If content is approved then the content can then be published by the Student Group.

If the content is rejected, it cannot be published in its current state. It will be returned to the Student Group with rational for the rejection and suggestions to remedy this. Once amendments have been made the content can be resubmitted for review to the appropriate stage which made the recommendations.

If content needs further approval, it will pass to the next stage review with guidance from the previous stage(s).

**Review Stage One**

The first stage review will be conducted by the appropriate member of staff and will normally take place within 2 working days of submission to the Union. It is your responsibility to send the pieces to [suactivitiesteam@city.ac.uk](mailto:suactivitiesteam@city.ac.uk) two days before publication to be reviewed according to this policy.

A student group dissatisfied with the outcome of review stage one can request that the content is considered under review stage two.

**Review Stage Two**

The second stage review will be conducted by the Sabbatical Officers. This will normally be conducted within 3 working days of the original submission.

This review will consider the concerns identified in stage one.