

# 1 Student Members' Meeting

## Agenda

5pm Tuesday 12th February 2019 | B200, University Building, Northampton Square

	Item	Paper Ref:	Lead:
1	<b>Welcome and Apologies</b>	N/A	Chair
2	<b>Minutes</b> To agree the accuracy and approve the minutes from the last meeting.	SMM-001	Chair
3	<b>Confirmation of Items for Any Other Business</b>	N/A	Chair
4	<b>Items specially brought forward by the Chair</b> To note any items brought forward by the Chair	N/A	Chair
<b>Items for Information</b>			
5	<b>Trustee Report on Union Activities</b>	SMM-002	KP
6	<b>Annual Accounts of the Union</b>		KP
<b>Items for Decision</b>			
7	<b>List of Affiliations</b>	SMM-003	KP
8	<b>Oppose PREVENT</b>	SMM-004	RS
9	<b>Support from the Union for groups of students enquiring about academic certainty</b>	SMM-005	RG
10	<b>Friday Prayer on Campus</b>	SMM-006	KE
11	<b>The Right To Clean Praying Facilities On Campus</b>	SMM-007	ZS
12	<b>Graduation Prices</b>	SMM-008	TK
13	<b>Keep Wednesday Afternoons Free</b>	SMM-009	EA
14	<b>Tackling Sexual Harassment on Campus</b>	SMM-010	TK
15	<b>Increasing Participation in Sport through Student Groups</b>	SMM-011	NB
16	<b>City Students' Union to Affiliate with Nightline</b>	SMM-012	NB
<b>Any Other Business</b>			
17	<b>Any Other Business</b> To consider any other business notified earlier	N/A	N/A

Secretary – Skye Golding, Wellbeing and Insight Coordinator  
Chair's Support – Angelo Weekes, SU Representation Manager

# Student Members Meeting Minutes - Unapproved

SMM-001

5pm Thursday 15 February 2018 | A130, College Building

Attendance record

School	Initials
Cass Business School	10
School of Arts & Social Sciences	46
School of Health Sciences	33
School of Mathematics, Computer Science & Engineering	60
The City Law School	16
<b>Total Number of Student Attendees*</b>	<b>165</b>

\*actual numbers fluctuated during the meeting, however quoracy (30) was maintained throughout.

Officers	Initials	Title
Olesea Matcovschi	OM	President
Malek Arab	MA	VP Education
Zulkaif Riaz	ZR	VP Activities & Development
Ali Yasen	AY	Chair of Student Council (Meeting Chair)

Staff in Attendance	Initials	Title
James Lindsay	JL	Membership Development Manager (Chair's Support)
Laura Dickens	LD	Academic Representation & Democracy Coordinator (Committee Secretary)
Magdalena Knitter	MK	Administration & Finance Coordinator (Door)
Yasmin Bowmer	YB	Wellbeing & Insight Coordinator (Door)

## Part One

### 1) Welcome and apologies

AY opened the meeting and welcomed attendees to the Student Members' Meeting and outlined meeting conduct.

### 2) Minutes

OM updated that as the Union was a newly found charity as of 1 August 2017, there were no meeting minutes available as this would be the first meeting since incorporation.

### 3) Confirmation of Items for Any Other Business

No Items were received.

**Question:** If students felt the University's safe space policy was being broken at any point, how should they communicate this?

**Answer (JL):** They should inform a member of Union Staff, who are dotted around the room by raising their hand.

#### 4) Items specially brought forward by the Chair

AY brought forward Item 16 UCU USS Pension Strike 2018 to Item 7 on the agenda, following a request from students unable to stay for the meeting duration. Subsequent items were moved a position down.

### Items for Information

#### 5) Trustee Report on Union Activities

OM, MA and ZA provided the meeting with an update on activities, including:

- Freshers' Fair – 5000 attendees and relocated to be held at the Business Design Centre
- RAG Week – £1800 made during the week, matched by Santander
- Union Advice – 608 students received academic advice
- Programme Reps – 711 Reps this year, new initiatives of Rep of the Month and lanyards. Coffee Mornings with School Representative Officers. Supporting Reps with course specific issues
- Tailored Officer-Led Training – sessions for Programme Reps and Society Leaders
- Student Media – new Radio Station and TV Station
- Study Well – a successful campaign to support students through their exams, in partnership with a host of University departments and Sodexo. Looking at Puppy Room for May
- Student Groups – 111 this year, a 50% increase from June 2017, only 3 disciplines without a relevant Academic Society and a new regular Societies Drop In. 5 new Society application and funding periods
- Societies Development Fund – increased to £20000 from £7000
- Sports Clubs – working to provide promotion and support to Clubs
- Cass Societies – working to give them support with the Business School
- Student Leadership Conference – run by the Union with speakers from the Inspired Speakers Network, Careers, LEaD and Student Development
- International City Week – have collaborated with the University to put on a host of events for the week, including an International Culture Show in CityBar on 22<sup>nd</sup> February
- International Women's Day – will be running an event in CityBar in the evening of 8<sup>th</sup> March to celebrate the achievements of women
- Surveys – encouraged students to complete the National Student Survey (NSS), Your Voice 1 and 2 (YV1 and YV2)
- Events – Black History Month – event exploring Black Attainment Gap, Islamophobia Awareness Month, Multi-faith Week
- Policy Reviews and Processes – External Speaker Policy, Extension and Late Submissions Policy with Union Advice
- Academic Impact Awards – encouraged students to complete nominations for staff and Programme Reps
- Prevent – working with University to lobby to comply with minimum requirements
- Lecture Capture – running a campaign with Programme Reps to spread its usage throughout the University

No questions were asked from the floor.

## 6) Management Accounts

OM updated that there are no management accounts available for the last year as City Students' Union incorporated into a company limited by guarantee as of 1<sup>st</sup> August 2017 and has only existed in its current form since then.

OM noted that there will be a set of accounts available later in the year when they have been approved by the auditors.

## Part Two

### Items for Decision

#### 16) UCU USS Pension Strike 2018

Paper Reference: SSM-010

OM introduced the motion and explained that this is a national issue for over 60 Universities, including Lecturers at City and Professional Service Staff on Grades 6-9. A vote had been carried out, and the local Universities and Colleges Union (UCU) Branch had voted to strike or carry out action short of a strike (ASOS) over the lack of progress and negotiation made over the proposals.

OM outlined that strikes are currently set to happen on 22, 23, 26-28 February and 5-9 and 12-16 March. OM confirmed that she was unsure how many would be participating in action and advised students to speak to their lecturers.

OM updated that UCU would be running a drop in on Monday 19 February to answer students' questions.

MA followed up OM's introduction by expressing that a strike is a difficult decision and that it's important to show staff solidarity.

There were no speeches against.

**Question:** Would it be appropriate to get lecturers to use lecture capture while strikes happening?

**Answer (MA):** MA encouraged students to look at the reasons lecturers would be striking. He noted that academics would see if they can mitigate the experience had on students. MA recommended to have a talk to lecturers to see if they could make lecture capture available.

#### Decision

The Meeting **approved** the motion.

## 7) Affiliations

Paper Reference: SSM-001

OM presented the proposed list of organisations that the Students' Union and Societies wished to affiliate to. OM noted that these would be voted on as a block.

There were no speeches against.

#### Decision

The Meeting **approved** the list of affiliations.

## 8) Free Events on Campus

Paper Reference: SSM-002

OM introduced the motion, explaining that each term the Students' Union runs events on campus at CityBar, where some events have a charge to enter. OM noted that she believes that the events need to be more affordable and accessible to take into account students who face financial difficulties, and therefore events run on campus should be either free or low admission.

There were no speeches against.

**Decision**

The Meeting **approved** the motion.

**9) Friday Happy Hour**

Paper Reference: SSM-003

Bashir Mohamed (BM) introduced the motion, explaining the issues that students had faced by having tutorials and lectures that clash with Friday Prayer times. He noted that lecture capture had been unavailable to students and that there was no way of getting notes from lectures that would be missed. He noted prayers bring students together and students should not have to choose between class and prayer.

There were no speeches against.

**Decision**

The Meeting **approved** the motion

**10) Make Programme Reps More Representative!**

Paper Reference: SSM-004a

Anna-Noemie Ouattara Boni (AO) firstly introduced the motion amendment, expressing that she was proposing the motion as BME Officer at City. She noted that City has students from over 160 nationalities, and that it isn't known when Programme Reps represent this. AO noted that she would like the University to collect more data on the race and ethnicity of Programme Reps to ensure that they are representative of students, following concerns raised at an event during Black History Month. If 10% of students identify as BME then it would look to be represented in Programme Reps.

AO commented that she was thinking on race and ethnicity as she was speaking for all students under the BME umbrella.

MA noted that as VP Education, this information is currently not assessed or collected, but he would want to find out where Reps are from. He noted that students are free to self-identify how they want to and this is not a way to push students to identify and that the purpose is to assess whether Reps are reflective of City.

There were no speeches against.

**Decision**

The Meeting **approved** the amendment (a) to the motion.

Paper Reference: SSM-004

There were no speeches against the motion.

**Decision**

The Meeting **approved** the motion

## **11) Shorten the Time Taken for Approving External Speaker to 14 Days**

Paper Reference: SSM-005

Tania Fahmeda Huda (TH) introduced the motion, stating that it currently takes 4 weeks for the University to approve external speakers, and that this motion would like to see it change to 14 days. TH updated that this directly impacts societies' abilities to efficiently run events, particularly when wondering if a speaker has been approved or not. TH commented that events are the core of societies, and the current process can be perceived to be bad externally.

Siddeeqah Ahmed (SA) seconded TH's introduction, and explained that this motion is to support societies, and to try to avoid further events having to be cancelled the day before due to current processes.

There were no speeches against the motion.

### **Decision**

The Meeting **approved** the motion.

## **12) Extension and Late Submission Policy**

Paper Reference: SSM-006

MA introduced the motion, explaining that the University has a KPI around student progression and retention. He outlined the irregularity in policies around extensions and late submissions that vary across the different Schools. He noted that this motion asks for a consistent approach to be University wide.

ZR confirmed that the current procedures negatively affect students.

**Question:** If for every day late you lose 5 marks, is it different if it's overall out of 10 or 20?

**Answer (MA):** The assumption is that it is out of 100% and not specific marks and is specific to coursework. For example, if you have a 40% coursework, it would be 5 marks out of 100%. If you have any ways you would like us to enhance it, please let us know. The proposal has come from an amalgamation of the best processes from across other Universities.

**Question:** Will it affect the amount of time that it takes for lecturers to get back to students?

**Answer (MA):** Lecturers may say that the turnaround time may be 24 hours more. Would like a leeway to a 3 day turnaround time as that will be better than the sector.

There were no speeches against.

### **Decision**

The Meeting **approved** the motion.

## **13) Society Led Friday Prayer through Students Union**

Paper Reference: SSM-007

Mohammed Khalef (MK) introduced the motion, and thanked everyone who had contributed to getting Prayer Rooms and the Great Hall to facilitate Friday Prayer. MK noted that the motion calls for prayers to be Society Led not University Led. MK gave the example of the examinations period and the difficulties students face in accessing prayers. MK made

reference to a Friday Prayers Survey that was conducted in 2015-16, where respondents stated they would like the prayers to be Society Led.

Samatar Xasan (SX) seconded MK's introduction to the motion and asked that students vote in favour.

There were no speeches against.

### **Decision**

The Meeting **approved** the motion.

## **14) A Sugar Smart policy for City, University of London** Paper Reference: SSM-008

Giovanni Fusco (GF) introduced the motion, asking attendees if firstly they had heard of the campaign, and secondly if they were familiar with Jamie Oliver. GF explained the ideas of the campaign, which looks to reduce the amount of sugar consumed and inform students of how much sugar is in the food they are consuming, as a way to reduce risks of type 2 diabetes and obesity. GF noted that he would like City to launch an information campaign to expand knowledge of sugar content, alternative recipes and provide time, space and posters.

**Question:** Is this policy informative?

**Answer (GF):** It will not prevent people eating what they would like.

**Question:** Would they be removing chocolate from the canteen?

**Answer (AY):** It is an informative policy not seeking to change food.

**Question:** Would we find out sugar content on food served in the canteen?

**Answer (GF):** There might be a conflict of interest as it may be against the interests of the canteen to do so. We will learn what they serve and how much sugar is in them.

### **Decision**

The Meeting **approved** the motion.

## **15) BDS**

Paper Reference: SSM-009

Shaima Dallali (SD) introduced the motion, noting that BDS is a movement for freedom and solidarity, and that the point of bringing this to students is that students and the University should be responsible and ethical. SD noted that the SU is morally committed to promote ethical interests and oppose anything that goes against this. SD noted that BDS is a global campaign that has been nominated for a Nobel Peace Prize.

Paper Reference: SSM-009a

SD introduced the amendment to the motion, including firstly, a recent example around Manchester Students' Union who had passed a BDS policy to show support across the country. Secondly, SD had provided amendments to ensure the SU would be acting within their legal framework. SD noted that the policy was not targeting Israel as a country but actions. SD noted that 'equity' had been removed from the policy as it was felt this did not apply and to ensure it reflected International Law.

**Question:** Noticed that the amendment removes the resolve to join the national BDS Movement, can you explain why?

**Answer (SD):** The reason it has been removed is because wanted to focus on what we want the Union to do. It's better and more reliable to add to ensure the welfare of students. The amendment clarifies the objectives and aims to remove confusion. It targets the Israeli Government and not targeting protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010.

**Question:** The amendment says you're not joining the BDS Movement? On the one hand want to join but have removed it. Can you clarify if the SU will be joining the BDS Movement?

**Answer (Abdurrahman Tamimi – AT):** BDS is a massive global campaign to promote to our students and the parts that apply to us. It is not reasonable to apply all BDS global to this campaign.

**Question:** So the SU would not be joining BDS?

**Answer (AT):** We are – BDS is a massive campaign which can tailor to students. Whatever campaigns, we want to try stay in and do what applies to us, e.g. boycott companies that work with the University.

**Question:** The answer is yes it is BDS?

**Answer (AT):** Yes.

**Question:** How is the University involved in companies and activities that are included in BDS? Can they say what the University is involved in that would affect us?

**Answer (AT):** I'll give an example – in Tait Building, they use HP Computers. They are the biggest supplier to Israeli Defence forces. Why not avoid investing/ working with companies that defy the values of the SU and work with other people.

AY reminded students that questions must relate to the amendment specifically as debate on the motion would be after the amendment had been decided upon.

**Question:** Where do we draw the line with the Israeli Government? Is every company that pays tax to the corporate government included in the boycott or is it the ones that get arms, equipment etc. Boycott, divest and sanctions are very strong words. It's a tense political conflict but lots are involved with jobs, family – it affects a lot of people in general, where do we draw the line – anyone involved or proven?

**Answer (AT):** When we talk about the Israeli Government, we talk about the unlawful acts. Not targeting collectively but companies that directly contribute to unlawful acts.

**Question:** Do you have a clear list of companies or do you make it up as you go?

**Answer (AT):** There is a list of companies – used HP as an example as they are the ones situated on campus and directly relates to our campus. We haven't removed anything from the motion but clarified.

**Question:** Who do you want to protest on campus?

**Answer (AT):** Have not learned the list as it's the concept that matters. HP is the biggest example.

**Question:** The distinction of illegal action and of Israel – seems arbitrary. HP just illegal operations or Israel operations – how would you determine it? Intel, Apple, Google – if talking about the companies involved in Israeli settlements. Current SU auditors are KPMG. Where does this end?

**Answer (AT):** Not attacking or targeting Israel, but the illegal acts of government. Targeting companies – not targeting those who live in Israel. We are targeting the unlawful acts, ones under International Law which opposes everything we stand for.

**Question:** Is the SU going to act as an International Tribunal?

**Answer (AT):** When we are referring to war crimes, we reference the UN. 28 UN resolutions have been broken by Israel. It has been from endorsed organisations around the world.

**Question:** Is it possible to investigate which organisations are on campus so can be banned?

**Answer:** International community has investigated.

At this point it was re-affirmed that the Meeting is a Safe-Space and members were requested to remain respectful to each other.

**Question:** Are we boycotting our technology for the purpose of protecting everyone?

**Answer (AT):** BDS is a strategic campaign. Not reasonable to boycott all. As students we have Dell computers, we don't need HP.

**Question:** This would include companies used for Israeli Military action. Apple, Google etc are all used. Are you saying all companies shall be boycotted?

**Answer (AT):** That is specifics and ignores the bigger picture. Both are the same in terms of illegal occupation. Agree that something is happening, difficult to tackle. Need to reverse control for which companies have greatest effect.

In the interests of time, AY moved the meeting to a vote on the amendment to the motion.

AY asked all members to remain seated whilst voting, keep quiet and to refrain from taking photos. Staff had to restart counting twice due to disturbances from the floor.

### **Decision**

The Meeting **approved** the motion.

For - 88

Against - 32

Abstentions - 2

**Question:** Isn't the voting system against different ethnicities considering the diversity of the student body?

**Answer (OM):** The voting process is outlined in our bye-laws as to how decisions are made at the Student Members Meeting – it is one vote per person in the room, therefore those who turn up can vote.

Paper Reference: SSM-009

AY brought the discussion round to the main motion.

**Question:** It was mentioned in the motion that the Union believes there should be an open dialogue where students and staff feel open to share views. This motion is a direct contradiction of that. In Israel there is conscription, where there is no choice to go to the army. Therefore by no platforming, you target individuals who came here to study, rather than entering into dialogue with them.

**Answer (SD):** BDS targets actions. Noam Chomsky has written in favour.

**Question:** You have stated that you are protesting the actions rather than people, but conscription takes place in Israel and those people may come here to study. Is it an open space for them as well?

**Answer:** Conscription – it's a choice of the Israeli Government to order soldiers to commit that crime. Not targeting Israeli population but the actions of the Israeli Government.

**Question:** Is there a single other country that this University or Union has a boycott against?  
**Answer (OM):** Not as far as we are aware.

**AT:** BDS is inspired by the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa. Academics previously boycotted against South Africa. In 2015, 300 Academics were involved in action around Israel, with a dedication to social justice.

**Question:** Several times South Africa has been mentioned. Israel and the boycott is not comparable. Boycott is anything towards overcoming oppression however no country singled out as a Jewish State.

**Answer (AT):** If concerned about any oppression, create a society and campaign. We are targeting the Israeli Government's actions – not Israel.

Eliana Friend (EF) spoke against the motion by outlining that on the website, City welcomes Israeli students' applications and that they are welcome despite differences, not reflected in the motion. EF noted that she would like to see the return of the Olive Branch Scholarship programme, which an effort to bring students in the affected area together.

SD spoke in favour of the motion by stating that all students are here for an education. The motion is to target the Israeli Government. Situation in Palestine is not something in the UN declaration.

Abigail Frohwein (AF) spoke against and challenged room on the record of Israel. She outlined that if the BDS Movement is a movement against every country, not undemocratic but it is targeted. She expanded that dealings with the nation state of Israel as explained in motion could be deemed anti-Semitic. She further explained that she felt the cause to be immoral and asked for building bridges not boycotts. She expressed that if the motion is not targeting Israel but the Government, then the Government is its people and targeting jobs would be discrimination.

AT summated the motion, by stating they'd made it simple from the start – this is not targeting Israeli people but a Government which passes unlawful actions. How do Palestinian students feel? It's their country and land. There is one way to go to peace. Israel has violated 28 UN resolutions – if you can find another country that has done that then we can talk again.

AY moved the meeting to a vote, in light of the time having passed the meeting's scheduled finished time and the number of speeches that had been made for and against.

The voting was suspended for a time as Staff dealt with a complaint from the floor. A member was asked to leave the meeting due to taking photos being taken whilst voting was taking place.

### **Decision**

The Meeting **approved** the motion.

For - 84  
 Against - 34  
 Abstentions - 7

### Any Other Business

#### **17) Any Other Business**

There were no items submitted to discuss.

## Items for Information

*This section includes information about what the Union did in 2017-18 and gives members a chance to question the Union about both the things it delivered and how the money was spent.*

*The end of this part gives members the chance to put questions to members of the Trustee Board.*

**Trustees Report on Union Activities & Annual Accounts**

**SMM-002**

Please follow the [link](#) below, or see our Student Members Meeting 2019 web page.



City\_Students\_Trust  
ee\_Report\_Accounts

## Part Two

### Items for Decision

<b>Paper Title</b>	List of Affiliations		
<b>Paper Number</b>	SMM-003		
<b>Summary</b>	<p>The Students' Union affiliates with external partners to help benefit our members and advance our strategic aims. Our Student Groups also affiliate with national and international organisations to help support and promote their activity, be recognised as an official group of the organisation or to benefit from access to support and training.</p> <p>Below is a list of the applications for affiliations 2018/19.</p>		
	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Other details</b>
	City, University of London Students Union	National Union of Students (NUS)	Total of £28,910.12 paid annually (2018/19)
	AIESEC City Society	AIESEC UK	
	Christian Union	UCCF: The Christian Unions	
	Erasmus Student Network	Erasmus Student Network UK	
	Girl Up Society	Girl Up	
	Hindu Society	National Hindu Students' Forum	Total of £105.00 paid annually
	Islamic Society	Federation of Student Islamic Societies (FOSIS)	
	Lawyers Without Borders Society	Lawyers Without Border	
<b>Action for Meeting</b>	To <b>approve</b> the affiliations listed above.		

**Oppose PREVENT****SMM-004****Proposer:** Rania Salim**Seconder:** Sayed Azam, Ruqaiyah Javaid (SHS School Representative Officer), Nazia Bharde (VP Activities and Development)**This Union notes:**

1. The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act (CTSA) 2015 placed a statutory requirement on ‘specified authorities’ – including universities and colleges – to ‘Prevent people being drawn into terrorism’, and therefore to implement the ‘Prevent’ strategy – this is known as the ‘Prevent duty’.
2. According to the Prevent Strategy, potential indicators of “radicalism” or “extremism” include:
  - a. “A desire for political, social or moral change.”
  - b. “Mental health issues.”
  - c. “Being at a transitional time of life.”
3. The Prevent strategy, as part of the government’s ‘counter-extremism’ agenda, has been used to create a vast surveillance system to spy on the public and to police dissent, systematically targeting Muslims and Black people.
4. Under the Prevent duty, student groups have been subject to conditions making it harder to host events or organise politically - including physical monitoring of events.
5. The government’s counter-terrorism/security policy is fundamentally flawed in its approach; its operant concepts of ‘extremism’ and ‘radicalism’ are elastic, and open to abuse for political ends.
6. That the National Union of Students (NUS), University and College Union (UCU) and dozens of student unions have both passed motions opposing the Act and Prevent, including City SU.
7. In January 2019 the government announced that they would be conducting an ‘Independent Review’ of Prevent.
8. The terms of this review are likely to be narrow, and focused mostly on building support for Prevent rather than deal with the root issues with Prevent or call for its scrapping.

**This Union believes:**

1. Islamophobia is massively on the rise across Europe, is state-sponsored and legitimised by the mainstream media.
2. The government’s identified ‘warning signs’ of “radicalisation” problematise and renders suspect those with mental health difficulties.
3. Academics, as well as anyone in a public sector job, should not have to be part of this surveillance. We fundamentally believe that universities and colleges are places for education, not surveillance.
4. The implementation of the Prevent strategy on campus has served to securitise our University, and narrow the space to be able to organise.

5. That as a Charity, we as a Union are not legally bound by the Prevent duty and should seek to boycott it as far as legally possible.

**This Union resolves:**

1. To mandate the Officers of this Union to not engage with, or implement any Prevent duty measures to which they are not legally bound, and to boycott it as far as legally possible. This includes not participating in the reporting on the activities of student societies to the Prevent department, implementing mitigating measures on events as indicated under the Prevent guidance and refusing to sit on the University's Prevent working group.
2. To release a statement expressing our opposition to Prevent and the Prevent duty for being racist and a threat to civil liberties.
3. To facilitate meetings between campus trade unions such as the UCU and Unison on combating the Prevent duty and its implementation on campus, and working towards minimum compliance of the duty by staff.
4. To work with the motion proposers to educate students on the dangers of Prevent strategy by supporting the anti-Prevent activism of students and student societies through funding resources and events.
5. To lobby the University to publicise how they are implementing the Prevent duty and other similar initiatives and apply this to the Union's own activities under Prevent. This involves:
  - a. Demanding publications of how the policy is operating within the University and Students' Union
  - b. and; Access to materials used to train staff and students
  - c. Holding consultations with the student body regarding how this affects students.
6. To refuse funding from Prevent or provided through counter-extremism programmes more broadly.
7. In the upcoming Independent Review of Prevent, the Union should lobby to ensure that the abolition of Prevent is an option for the outcome, and push for this out of the review.
8. In the event of attempts to broaden the outreach of Prevent on campus, including but not limited to, monitoring of student activity in the Prayer and Multi Faith room through card swiping and/or cameras, changes to IT usage policies including monitoring/blocking of websites, the Union should support students' actions to push back against this.

**Academic Certainty****SMM-005**

**Proposer:** Raha Ghadaksaz  
**Seconder:** Samreen Babar

**This Union notes:**

1. The university should provide a reasonable and formal path for groups of students looking to appeal where significant and urgent academic matters are concerned i.e. examinations and assessments.
2. The university should take the responsibility of investigating into whether students were adequately examined or assessed and provide suitable paths for rectification where they are found to have not.
3. The university should strive to give genuine consideration to students' concerns and communicate what is being done where relevant.

**This Union believes:**

1. Approval of this motion will provide students with further assistance where there is mass concern with the standard of examination or assessment and where there is a request for clarification of the method of grading on significant academic work.
2. Students will feel more supported and gain better standing with endorsement and / or guidance from the union where there are large numbers of concerned students and justified reasoning for questioning the outcome of their academic work.
3. Backing from the union will urge the university to take students' concerns into genuine consideration and ensure fair and standardised academic outcome.

**This Union resolves:**

1. Groups of students should be supported by the union in their request for justification of academic grading on their work from the university. Further, where possible and relevant the union should provide information on students' existing rights and guidance on means of submitting a request.
2. Where inadequate justification or lack of clarity is provided, students should be supported by the union when they request further academic consideration from the university itself and / or other academic authorities as a group of students.
3. Where this consideration finds lack of reasoning or consideration is not given or improperly given, the union should assist a group of students in reaching out to higher university authority or other academic authorities for rectification where there is a strong possibility of examination error.

**Friday Prayer on Campus****SMM-006****Proposer:** Kawthar El- Rrakik**Seconder:** Sadia Medina Hameed**This Union notes:**

1. City, University of London has a diverse student population, including large Muslim and international students' cohorts. It is a religious requirement for Muslim men to perform the congregational Friday prayer (Jumu'ah) and is an important part of all Muslims' lives.
2. The Equality Act 2010 states that religion and beliefs are protected characteristics. NUS policy states that it will "support student faith groups negotiate for improved services and gain acknowledgement from their institutions of their specific needs". This naturally extends to its member Students' Unions.
3. Providing Friday prayers on campus is necessary for students- Friday prayers can occur in between lectures, which makes it inconvenient for students to have to leave campus to pray.
4. Praying together as students increases the sense of a "City community". Almost all Universities make provisions for the Friday prayer to take place on campus.
5. Arrangements for Friday prayers off campus are not suitable for students- the local mosque can become very crowded, with members of the Islington community also using this space.

**This Union believes:**

1. Friday prayers should have a designated space (the Great Hall), which is reserved at the appropriate times. This should be arranged through a block booking by Students' Union staff, on behalf of the student population.
2. Friday prayers are essential to making Muslim and international students feel welcome at City, University of London.

**This Union Resolves:**

1. The Students' Union will lobby the University to continue to facilitate Friday prayers for both Muslim male and female students on campus.
2. The Students' Union will work with the relevant Muslim societies to ensure that society-led Friday prayers on campus take place smoothly. This includes, allowing booking forms for Friday prayers in the Great Hall to be the same as any other room booking.
3. The Students' Union to work with the University to ensure adequate provisions are in place for Friday prayers during the revision periods.

**The Right to Clean Praying Facilities on Campus****SMM-007****Proposer:** Zakariya Sheikh**Seconder:** Nabeel Shah**This Union notes:**

1. The University should be a safe and clean place for students to study and practice their faith.
2. The Muslim prayer rooms are regularly used by hundreds of Muslim students on campus, just as much as lecture theatres, labs and seminar rooms and therefore requires regular cleaning.
3. Due to its popularity, the prayer room will inevitably become unclean. The prayer room needs to be maintained in order for students on campus to use it.

**This Union believes:**

1. Faith plays an important role in student's lives on campus. City, University London should aim to meet the needs of religious groups on campus and provide clean facilities.
2. Prayers are essential in building a community within the Muslim population on campus.

**This Union resolves:**

1. The Union will lobby the university to ensure that the female and male prayer rooms will be cleaned and maintained on a weekly basis.
2. The Union will lobby the University to ensure that a set time and day during the week will be set by students on campus and PAF to ensure that this is carried out effectively whilst minimising the impact on Muslim students. A notice must be left in the prayer stating the fixed time and day when the prayer rooms will be cleaned.
3. The Union will liaise with all relevant groups to ensure that the ablution facilities in both prayer rooms are maintained.

**Graduation Prices****SMM-008**

**Proposer:** Tuna Kunt (VP Education)  
**Seconder:** Ed Armitage (Sports Officer)

**The Union notes:**

1. Our home and EU undergraduate students pay over £9,000, overseas undergraduates pay over £13,000 and postgraduate fees range from £10,000 to over £20,000 for home, EU and overseas students.
2. Graduation ceremony tickets for our Graduands' guest are £25 each.
3. All Graduands attending a Ceremony are required to wear the academic dress from the institution's preferred company, 'Ede and Revencroft'.
4. The fee a Graduand is required to pay to hire an academic dress is £45. (The motion is concerned only with gown hire and not purchase).

**This Union believes:**

1. City students have the right of value for their money, especially considering the fees that our students are paying and the student debt many face for their education.
2. Students should be able to attend their graduation ceremonies without having to pay for their gowns.
3. £25 ticket price for a guest is deemed expensive.

**The Union resolves:**

1. City, University of London should not charge for gown hires.
2. City, University of London should subsidise graduation ticket prices.
3. City, University of London should not lower the standards of graduation ceremonies while doing so. This includes the venue, drinks reception and the stalls made available on the day for graduates including external companies.

**Keep Wednesday Afternoons Free****SMM-009****Proposer:** Ed Armitage (Sports Officer)**Seconder:** Tuna Kunt (VP Education)**The Union notes:**

1. All 5 schools currently have a range of timetabled activities (lectures, seminars, clinics etc.) after Wednesday afternoons, especially for postgraduate students.
2. It is common practice for UK higher education institutions to not schedule classes, to encourage students to take part in extracurricular activities such as competing in sports teams, participating in society and other Students' Union activities, take on volunteering responsibilities and other opportunities.
3. Many Unions and Universities have recently and successfully implemented the KWAF campaign as highlighted in the [NUS report](#).
4. KWAF principles are mostly concerned with UG students and PG students do not benefit from it on a large scale.

**This Union believes:**

1. Student experience transcends over lectures and seminars, and includes all extracurricular opportunities that our students take part in. This consequently is connected to the University's priorities such as student satisfaction, progression and employability.
2. Allocating an afternoon to be free of timetabled activities would allow students to participate more in societies, volunteering, sports and more.
3. Students who are already engaged and have to miss timetabled activities on Wednesday afternoons would also benefit from KWAF.
4. For the Union, postgraduate students are a hard to reach group and freeing Wednesday afternoons would give them the opportunity to take on Union activities, participate in sports teams and take on extracurricular activities.

**The Union resolves:**

1. City, University of London should not timetable classes on Wednesday afternoons to give students the best opportunities to take part on a range of extracurricular activities.

## Tackling Sexual Harassment on Campus

SMM-010

**Proposer:** Tuna Kunt (VP Education)

**Seconder:** Yasemin Kaya

### The Union notes:

1. The current complaints procedure at City is not clear and not student-friendly. However, City, after a long consultation period with a working group is acting to fix this issue.
2. The Union, although feels very strongly against sexual harassment and violence, does not have any output on the matter at the moment such as social media\physical campaigns or information online, workshops etc.
3. The Union does not currently have a formal relationship with the halls of residence that City students prefer.
4. The definition of sexual harassment goes beyond physical acts and includes words, behavior and actions of sexual nature. ([UN report on what constitutes as sexual harassment, Equality Act 2010](#))
5. The Student Lifestyle Survey shows that 28.1% of our female student responders and 5.1% male student responders have experienced sexual harassment.
6. The aforementioned survey also shows that of the students, who have experienced sexual assault, 38.4% of females and 36.9% of males experienced it in City Bar and an average of 9.85% of female and male responders experienced sexual assault in halls.

### This Union believes:

1. Awareness and training is key to battling with sexual harassment on campus.
2. The Union is in a position to reach students well, especially student leaders, to raise awareness on consent and key information on what constitutes as sexual harassment.
3. City, University of London should be more proactive and work in partnership with the Union to raise awareness, to implement effective preventative measures and a clear and transparent complaints procedure, along with survivor support.

### The Union resolves:

1. Relevant consent and by-stander trainings should be made available to student leaders (programme reps, part-time and full-time officers, society leaders and sports teams).
2. City Bar staff must be trained on by-stander intervention.
3. A clear mechanism for reporting incidents must be made available on both the City, University of London and City Students' Union pages. The process must be student-friendly and transparent.
4. Anonymous reporting must be implemented by City, University of London (not for prosecution of alleged perpetrators, but understand what we can all do more to ensure the safety of our students by identifying physical problem areas of our campus and behavioral patterns that we can target).
5. An awareness campaign must be ran every year to educate on what constitutes as sexual harassment to our students and staff.
6. The Union should liaise with halls to work on preventative measures and support for survivor

**Increasing Participation in Sport through Student Groups****SMM-011****Proposer:** Nazia Bharde (VP Activities & Development)**Seconder:** Ed Armitage (Sports Officer)**This Union notes:**

1. City, University of London has a very diverse student population and according to Sport England Black and Asian Ethnic Minorities are less likely to participate in sport (i).
2. That affiliated student groups, including societies, student media and RAG are not currently insured to participate in sport that takes place off campus.
3. A number of affiliated student groups have contacted the Vice President Activities and Development and would like to run their own sports events for their members.
4. Exercise positively impacts on an individual's mental health (ii)
5. That not all affiliate student groups would be able to fund the relevant insurance to participate in sport.

**This Union believes:**

1. That by supporting students already engaged in affiliated student groups the Union would be positively supporting students to be more active and have an improved mental health.
2. That by affiliated student groups being more active in sport, this would positively impact on the number of Black and Asian Ethnic Minorities participating in sport.

**This Union Resolves:**

1. To lobby City, University of London to ensure that their insurance incorporates all Union affiliated student groups so they are able to participate in sport, or to provide the additional funding to the Union to separately insure these groups.

i. <https://www.sportengland.org/media/4413/he-sport-survey-national-summary-year-3.pdf>

ii. <https://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/publications/how-to-using-exercise>

**City Students' Union to Affiliate to Nightline****SMM-012****Proposer:** Nazia Bharde (VP Activities & Development)**Seconder:** Tuna Kunt (VP Education)**This Union notes:**

1. That Nightline is an independently registered charity offering listening, support and information to higher education students by way of a confidential helpline.
2. That Nightline offer support to half a million students at our 38 affiliated universities across greater London as well as University of London and Open University students in all regions and countries.
3. That Nightline is able to provide crucial out-of-hours peer support via phone, Skype, email and instant messaging services.
4. That City, University of London and City, University of London Student's Union are currently not affiliated to Nightline.

**The Union believes:**

1. Nightline is a crucial tool that is in the demand of students' and it is a necessary resource that all City students should have access too.
2. The university mental health and counselling service is not sufficient for student use, specifically during out of hours timings.
3. Students can benefit both ways by being trained as student volunteers for the organisation, which is essentially building a much stronger community and peer-peer support system.

**The Union resolves:**

1. To lobby the university to affiliate with Nightline alongside the Union.