

Leeds University Union

Union Council Minutes

Date: 8th March 2009

Location: ARC Conference Room

Present: Adam Harper, Beenal Tailor, Chris Belcher, Georgina Bye, Hanif Leylabi, Hannah Greenslade, Jack Smith, Jak Codd, Nicholas Jones, Janaty Kondos, Joshua Landy, Lagun Akinloye, Madeline Harris-Smith, Mark Sowards, Michael Gladstone, Miriam Shaath, Pardeep Nijjar, Rachel Wenstone, Rosy Dorfman, Sean McHale, Shehab Mujdab, Sophia James, Helen Lakomska/Josina Maynard, Rosy Dorfman, Lucy Gabrett, Colin Traub

In attendance: Diane Pedder, Emily Spurrell, Akram Salhab, Joey Severn, Jack Smith, Guy Mitchell

Minute taker: Stephen Dowson

Reference: UC/0910/Ref2

1. Apologies for absence

Marcus Crawley

2 Chairs Opening Comments

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and highlighted the regulations that this Union Council must adhere too when conducting this meeting

Directing Union Council to Bye Law 1.27;

Union Council may take no normative judgment on any motion or amendment. Union Councillors are advised to only block the passage of motions or amendments under the following criteria:

- (i) **Where student safety may be put at risk.**
- (ii) **Where passage of the motion would endanger the future of the organization due to breach of the law, undue financial risk or serious risk to the reputation of the organization.**
- (iii) **Where the motion or amendment has no relevance to students.**

The Chair stated that roll-calls would only be used on the motions themselves, not the amendments. It was asked that amendments be included on the roll-call and this was put to a vote.

Votes for – 6

Votes against – 4

Abstentions – 11

Roll Calls would be taken on amendments.

The Chair then moved to the first motion

3. Referendum Motions

3.1 Motion 1: Should LUU oppose industrial action on campus that negatively impacts on the education of students?

Mike Gladstone Spoke about the motion;

- Highlighted there needed to be a debate on the issue of cuts and strike action.
- This motion would fire that debate

Amendment 1.1

This Amendment was withdrawn by the proposer as the title had been changed by steering

Motion 1

MG said he had nothing further to add

RD Spoke about the motion;

- She mentioned that motion could damage our reputation in the face of other SU's who were supporting educators

Vote held on the motion

A vote was taken on Motion 1

For	Against	Abstain
MHS, JC, MG, SJ, JL, CB, JK, AH, MS, RW, GB, CT, ADS, JM	RD, PN, LG	HG, HL, NJ
15	3	4

PASSED

3.2 Motion 2: Should LUU support University staff and their trade unions in legitimate strategies they employ to defend our education and oppose cuts?

Neither the Proposer or Seconder was present

The Chair pointed out that steering had recommended that this motion falls

HG – Couldn't understand why this motion had been singled out by steering

The Chair explained that steering felt that this motion had already attempted to go to Extraordinary Referendum and has failed

HL - highlighted that the failing of Extraordinary Referendum has nothing to do with whether this motion passes

SJ- Isnt there a compromise that UC could choose the motion- Chair stated that this was not possible without the proposer or seconder present

Amendment 2.1

Proposed By Kathryn Rose

KR – spoke why she believed the motion should pass. She provided evidence to why her amendments need to be accepted as they correct are factual inaccuracies

HL- Spoke against this motion, not historically accurate doesn't provide an accurate picture.

NJ- asked why is it so important to stick so rigorously to the Bye-Laws, they seem to be constraining discussion.

The minute taker highlighted our legal obligations state we must stick to our agreed bye-laws as approved by the membership

Chair – moved to vote on amendment 2.1

A vote was taken on Amendment 2.1

For	Against	Abstain
MHS, JC, MG, SJ, JL, CB, LA, RD, RW, GB, ADS, JM	HG,JK, HL, AM, MS, NJ, LG, BT, PN	AH, CT
12	9	2

Passed

Amendments 2.2

Proposed By Kathryn Rose

KR - spoke for this motion – noted and highlighted that this motion would correct factual inaccuracies. She also withdraws part 4 of her amendment as it is no longer relevant

HG - argued that this is opinion rather than fact, the point of referendum is to state what we believe, this amendment will change the spirit

Chair moved to vote

A vote was taken on Amendment 2.2

For	Against	Abstain
MHS, JC, MG, JL	HG, JK, AH, HL, MS, RW, GB,ADS,JM, BT	SJ, CB, LA, RD,AM, PN, LG, CT
4	10	8

Failed

Motion 2

Speech for made by HL – believes this motion should be passed, we should not be blackmailed by the poor structures. We must then deal with the consequences of this after.

Speaker pointed out that conflicting motions would be sent to the Board of Trustees for a ruling

AS – Believes these are reconcilable motions, why cant they be merged

Speaker pointed out this wasn't possible without proposer or seconder present

MG – We should be deciding this motion not the Board of Trustees, why bother having this system if we are simply going to give it to the Board when the decision gets hard.

HL – argued that would we have we approved this if it was first on the agenda?

HG – Argued we should vote on whether UC believe that this motion is the same business as the previous motion

The Chair ruled it was the same business

HL – Challenged the ruling of the char, it is argued that this the same business, we should debate whether they are. He moved for a vote

8 agreed with the challenge
11 against
2 abstentions

The Chairs ruling stands

HL summated the motion and urged council to accept the motion

A vote was taken on Motion 2

For	Against	Abstain
HG, AH, HL, RD, AM, NJ, JM	MHS, JC, MG, SJ, CB, RW, CT, ADS	JK, MS, GB, LG
7	8	4

FAILED

- 3.3 Motion 3:** Should LUU adopt Jack Straw as its first honorary president?

This motion was withdrawn by the proposer on the advice of steering committee

- 3.4 Motion 4:** Should LUU close down the 'Peanut Gallery' and replace it with a service which benefits all its members?

Adam Graham spoke on this motion. Argued that this motion served the majority of students.

Amendment 4.1

Guy Mitchell spoke for this motion – he said it weighted the argument and said it was impossible to create a service that benefited all students.

JC – said the current title was aspirational

Chair moved to vote

A vote was taken on Amendment 4.1

PASSED

For	Against	Abstain
MHS, HG, SJ, CB, AH, HL, AM, PN, MS, RW, JM, BT	MG, GB, ADS	JC, JL, JK, RD, CT
12	3	5

Amendment 4.2

Jak Codd spoke on this Amendment, he said if the Peanut was to close it would be a shame to lose the Piano

AH – its current location is out of the so other students would not be annoyed by it.
Chair moved to vote

A vote was taken on Amendment 4.2

For	Against	Abstain
MHS, JC, MG, SJ, CB, AH, GB, CT, ADS, JM,	HG, HL, RD, AM, MS, RW, NJ, LG, BT	JL, JK, LA, PN
10	9	4

PASSED

Amendment 4.3

SDZ spoke for this amendment, she said that the current conclusions are not current with current notes and believes and that this amendment would balance out the issues raised by the notes and believes.

A heated debate took place on this amendment

The chair called for a vote

A vote was taken on Amendment 4.3

For	Against	Abstain
HG, JK, AH, HL, RD, AM, PN, MS, NJ, LG, JM, BT	MHS, JC, MG, SJ, JL, CB, LA, RW, GB, CT, ADS,	
12	11	0

PASSED

The Chair at this point called for a 5 minute break

SJ – called for an emergency amendment. Amendment to change the Resolves to read

This Union Resolves:

1. To close down the Peanut Gallery and replace it with a service that benefits all members of LUU.

This amendment was accepted by the proposer.

This caused more debate to ensue which wasn't able to be recorded. The chair called the meeting to order.

HG – asked whether the above amendment was concurrent to the

rules in the bye-laws

The Minute taker confirmed that there was no rule against this.

Akram Salhab made a speech against this motion – He argued on the point of allocation, gave a dictionary definition of the term which he believed supported this arguemnt. He argued this motion breached article 17 of the Bye-Laws, he also said we were breaching other bye-laws as this space had been approved last year in the democratic structures motion.

Chair gave the definition of allocation used by steering, Allocation is giving resources, not taking away.

This was debated

MG – this is exactly why this needs to go to referendum as there is clearly a debate that needs to be had on the Peanut gallery.

Procedural motion to go to vote

11 for
12 against
0 abstentions

The motion was continually debated.

The argument centred around the interpretation of allocation

Chair moved for the vote.

A vote was taken on Motion 4

For	Against	Abstain
MHS, JC, MG, SJ, CB, LA, GB	HG, JK, AH, HL, RD, AM, PN, MS, NJ, LG, JM, BT	RW, CT
8	12	2

FAILED

3.5 Motion 5: Should LUU adopt the proposed new democratic system?

Proposer and Secunder Present.

Hannah Greenslade – Introduced the motion – part of a long process that has involved wide and extensive work with student groups

Amendment 5.1

KR – talked about amendment, and wanted to safeguard union profit.

MG – talked against the motion, our profits vary from year to year, this amendment may hamper our recruitment

Amendment withdrawn

Amendment 5.2

Amendment Withdrawn

Amendment 5.3

Amendment Withdraw

SJ – Amendment put forward to add new resolves – to work with minority and liberation groups to ensure that their voices are heard within this democratic structure in a 2 month time frame.

The Proposer Accepted this amendment

HG spoke in favour of the overall motion, highlighted the need for change and to reform our democratic systems

HL – spoke that most of the details that would form the new Bye-Laws would be passed through UC – isn't this counterproductive? He also questioned how extensive consultation has been. Would this also negatively affect diversity groups

MG – Diversity is the heart of this organisation, it is a core theme of this proposal. UC is not working and its needs change

HG – Would not have championed this motion if she didn't believe it would change LUU for the better and better represent students.

HL- the dangers of interpretation mean that this could damage our reputation due to the gaps in our liberation campaigns. Feels it should be pushed back till the detail is sorted.

RD – will vote for, but has issues with questions unanswered as yet by the proposal

MG – We need to let go of our power at UC and give it back to the students we claim to represent

HL – all change isn't always good change, this motion has the potential to break so many of the issues mentioned in the bye-laws

Chair moved to a vote.

A vote was taken on amended Motion 5

For	Against	Abstain
MHS, JC, MG, HG, SJ, JL, CB, AH, LA, RD, RW, GB, LG, CT, LM	HL, PN, NJ	JK, AM, BT
15	3	3

PASSED

3.6 Motion 6: Should LUU expand the current facilities of the Peanut Gallery

Proposed by Akram Salhab

Akram spoke in favour – This motion is about improving a valued space within the Union

Amendment 6.1

GM – fleshes out the argument and the motion, done in discussion with peanut. Should also stop breach of article 17

Amendment accepted by the proposer

Akram spoke in favour of this motion – The peanut has looked long and hard at itself as an organisation and we need to open ourselves up more for more student engagement and expand our facilities and we have recognised the issue

MHS – said this motion, even with this amendment still breached article 17 of the Bye-law

SDZ – argued the amendments stop these issues

MG – spoke against motion thought it was disgusting that the members of the peanut would contradict their own aims by claiming to be democratic yet passing such a motion

MHS – backed up this argument

A vote was taken on Motion 6

For	Against	Abstain
HG, JK, AH, HL, RD, AM, PN, LG, JM, BT, MS	MHS, JC, MG, SJ, CB, LA, RW, GB, CT, NJ	
11	10	0

PASSED

3.7 Motion 7: Should LUU disaffiliate from NUS?

This motion was removed by the proposer

3.8 Motion 8: Should the LUU Advertising Policy be amended to better support Student Activity Groups?

Justin Landry – put forward this motion on behalf of Activities Assembly as they felt that clubs and societies weren't getting the support they needed. This motion will make the changes needed to support societies.

Amendment 8.1

MHS spoke in favour of this amendment – this amendment will clarify this and to include welfare aims as part of this, make it clear it will go to a committee and regulate the influence of pubs and clubs

JL – We need to be realistic, a lot of societies take funding from bars and clubs, we are already very clear on this to clubs and societies about breaking these rules. If we had to register every favour from bar and club it would seriously hamper the ARC.

The Chair then moved to a vote

For	Against	Abstain
MHS, MG, SJ, HL, AM, NJ, CT, BT	HG, JL, CB, LA, RD, RW	JC, GB, LG, JM
8	6	4

Amendment 8.2

MHS proposed this amendment – the motion currently leaves the door open the door for companies such as medicine testing and gambling. This simply includes those on the list on welfare issues.

JL – This motion has been passed by activities assembly, its disappointing the UC doesn't back its proposal with these amendments. This is what these students want, why are we dictating them.

SJ – Questioned the vote taken at activities assembly.

JL – Sports clubs don't have legislation, yet we don't see them flocking to bad companies. The process was inclusive and worked hard on his motion.

MHS – Questioned whether Sports clubs have opted out the advertising policy previously

JL – They did in sports committee in 2008

JL – Spoke that he is here to defended the wishes of his assemblies and the students he was voted to represent.

GM – gambling wrecks lives, gave a personal account on the dangers, we shouldn't endorse anything that promotes this kind of behaviour

Motion accepted by JL

Motion 8:

JL- spoke in favour, this motion is going to be of great use to our clubs and societies.

The Chair then moved to a vote

For	Against	Abstain
MHS, JC, MG, JL, CB, LA, RW, GB, CT	HG, SJ, AH	HL, RD, AM, NJ
9	3	4

Motion Passed

Motion 9: Should the LUU confirm the change the name of the show that broadcast on Monday 12-1 (LSRFM.com) from 'Loose Men' to 'Loose Men 2.0'?

Neither the Proposer or the Seconder were present

A procedural motion was tabled to vote on motion immediately
 Unanimous for.

The Chair then moved to a vote

For	Against	Abstain
MG, HG, AH, LG	MHS, JC, SJ, JL, CB, HL, RD, AM, RW, GB, NJ, CT, JM, BT	RD
4	14	1

Motion FAILED

Motion 10: Should LUU commit to reducing its edible waste?

Neither the Proposer or the Seconder were present

A procedural motion was tabled to vote on motion immediately
 Unanimous for.

The Chair then moved to a vote

For	Against	Abstain
MG, HG, AH, LG, MHS, JC, SJ, JL, CB, HL, RD, AM, RW, GB, NJ, CT, JM, BT	MG	JM
18	1	1

Motion PASSED

Ross Markham Spoke in favour – He made three clear points. It is a we don't stock One Water, The ban hurts us financially , and it does very little to change attitude to green attitudes and green politics

Amendment 11.1

Adam Harper Proposed the amendment – asked for the belives to be removed . The amendment made it clear on what slogans were used during the campaign.

The Chair then moved to a vote

For	Against	Abstain
MG, HG, AH, LG, MHS, MG, SJ, JL, CB, HL, RD, AM, NJ, BT		JC, LA, RW, GB, CT, JM
14		6

Amendment Passes

Amendment 11.2

Proposer of the amendment not present

SJ – this is not a helpful amendment to motion 11 and has impossible aims

The Chair then moved to a vote

For	Against	Abstain
	MG, HG, AH, LG, MG, SJ, JL, CB, HL, RD, AM, NJ, BT JC, LA, RW, GB, CT	MHS, JM
0	18	2

Amendment 11.3

Amendment accepted by proposer

Amendment 11.4

GM to balance the question but supported 11.5 more

Proposer Withdrew Amendment

Amendment 11.5

SHZ - to balance the debate and making clear what we are trying to do

RM – disagreed with this interpretation as it was about giving people choice

HL – spoke in favour giving a choice sounds like students weren't given a choice in the first place

JC – disagreed with this, he argued it was about reinstating choice

The Chair then moved to a vote

For	Against	Abstain
AH, AM, BT, HL, RD, HG, LG, NJ,	RW, GB, JL, JC, MG, LA, CT,	CB, SJ, MHS, JM
8	7	4

Title is Now changed

An emergency motion was tabled by Kat rose to edit 'to continue selling One water' to 'to start selling one water' changes resolves this **was accepted**

Motion 11

HG spoke against on reputation issues- this would be seen as stupid by external organisations that are championing us.

JC – Our reputation may even be enhanced, it shows we ask the questions and we get students to make the big decisions

The Chair then moved to a vote

For	Against	Abstain
CB, AH, AM, RW, GB, BT, HL, SJ, MHS, LA, CT	RD, HG, LG	
8	3	0

Motion Passed

The meeting was called to a close