



Union General Meeting Minutes

Time:	17:00-19:00
Date:	26 th April 2016
Location:	JCR

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Minutes & Matters Arising
3. Report from Sabbatical Officers
4. Vote of No Confidence in Postgrad Student Research Officer/RSA President
5. Condemnation of extreme action during Student protests.
6. Emergency Motions

Ref#	Action/Discussion	Notes
1	HS introduced herself as chair and welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2	There were no objections to the minutes and no matters arising.	Minutes approved
3	<p>ZD gave dates for the End of Term Party – 2nd June at Electrowerkz. SOAS Festival will be on Friday 3rd June and he encouraged societies who wanted to be involved to get in touch. He updated on the Decolonising our University Working Group being formed in order to feed into the curriculum review.</p> <p>TK reported on the interforum happening on 27th April at 12pm. He updated on the developments regarding the cleaners' campaign, the funding for the consent workshops won by the Union and harassment research being written into a report.</p> <p>HS updated on the Attainment Gaps Survey and explained that the School was doing similar research. She encouraged people to fill in the online survey. She also updated on the success of the Participatory Budgeting initiative and gave</p>	All Co-President reports unanimously accepted

	<p>the date of the next meeting (Weds 27th April). She spoke about the Union's Welfare Strategy for exam period, the Union's Governance Review and a Scholarship programme that had been extended.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Speech For: The proposer of the motion explained they feel the Research Students' Association could achieve much more than it currently is. They outlined that the PGR officer had been in the role for three years and feels the wider PHD body isn't consulted on a number of matters.</p> <p>Speech against: The PGR Officer explained that they were elected with unopposed 640 votes in the Spring elections. He stated that any student could have stood in the elections. He also gave an explanation for his absence at meetings.</p> <p>Speech For: A student explained that they received more information from the International Students' Officer than the PGR Officer and felt there had been a problem with conveying information.</p> <p>Speech against: A student explained they were only notified of this motion today and felt a vote of no confidence was not an appropriate way to deal with concerns.</p> <p>A student suggested that PGR Officer should only be voted on by PGR Students. HS responded that this would be part of the Governance Review.</p> <p>Closing speech for: The proposer explained that they understood it was a contentious issue, but that it had been brought up over the whole academic year with no change.</p> <p>Closing speech against: The PGR Officer highlighted the evidence he had brought to the meeting, including elections emails sent on numerous dates from which people could have stood in the elections.</p> <p>Point of information: A student asked if all students can vote for the PGR Officer and whether Mohamed could stand again in the elections if the Vote of No Confidence was upheld.</p> <p>Vote: 34 in favour, 27 against, 8 abstentions. Due to lack of quorate (80 votes) the motion fell.</p>	

<p>5</p>	<p>Speech for: The proposer explained that he is a firm supporter of direct action and peaceful protest but felt there are limits. He explained that affects the lives of SOAS students and felt staff members were not being treated with dignity and respect.</p> <p>Speech against: TK welcomed the motion but explained the SU was already engaging with most of the points put forward in the resolves section. He stated that the SU does not tolerate intimidation and has already spent a number of hours speaking to members about what isn't acceptable. He believes that management would take this motion passing as a green light to exclude certain students.</p> <p>Speech For: The proposer explained that they were seeking a list of actions that the Union saw as unacceptable.</p> <p>Speech against: A student explained that this conversation was essential and encouraged people who felt uncomfortable with the protests to attend meetings and participate.</p> <p>Vote on the Motion: Motion falls</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p>Emergency Motion:</p> <p>Vote of Confidence in the SU Supporting Students Undergoing Disciplinaries</p> <p>Speech for: The proposer explained that the School was targeting students with disciplinaries, and that the SU should support and back these students.</p> <p>A discussion followed about what constitutes a political disciplinary. The proposer of the motion explained that a show of solidarity was important.</p> <p>Vote on the Motion: 2 abstentions. Motion passed.</p>	