



Annual General Meeting Minutes

Date: 6th June 2023

Time: 3pm-5pm

Location: Zoom

Chair: Hafsa Haji (Goldsmiths Students' Union)

Over 100 student members in attendance.

In attendance:

Hafsa Haji (Chair)

Gioia Scazza (GS)

Sushant Singh (SS)

Ekabali Ghosh (EG)

Vishnu PR (VPR)

Bhoopendra Kumar Ahiwar (BKA)

Matthew Zimmer (MZ)

Sam Landis (SL)

Abel Harvie-Clark (AHC)

Harshul Singh (HS)

Kai Simmons (KS)

Charlotte Morris-Davis (CMD) - Secretary

Item No	Item
1.	Introduction
	<p>The Chair of the Annual General Meeting, Hafa Haji, opened the meeting and deemed the meeting quorate.</p> <p>The Chair stated that voting would take place via Zoom polls.</p> <p>The Chair called a vote of meeting participants to confirm they are satisfied with the meeting set up and technology. Indicative result - majority vote in favour.</p> <p>The Chair ran through the meeting agenda and safe space procedure.</p> <p>The Chair set out the speaking rights of members as set out in the Constitution and Schedules. The Chair stated that an indicative result would be announced during the meeting, following the meeting all votes will be validated to ensure they came from student members and the validated results would be emailed to all meeting participants. The validated results can be seen in appendix one.</p> <p>The Chair set out the procedural points as set out in the Schedules of the Constitution.</p>
2.	Ratification of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting
	<p>The Chair called a vote. Indicative result - majority vote in favour.</p>
3.	Receiving the report of the Charity Trustees on the Union’s Activities since the previous AGM
	<p>GS presented the update on behalf of the Charity Trustees. They set out key areas of work that the Sabbatical Team have undertaken throughout the year including establishing the Liberation Caucuses, delivering a range of events surrounding Afrophobia and the reduction of programmes related to African studies, supporting the Student Rep network and supporting UCU and Unison strike action.</p>
4.	Receiving the accounts of the Union for the previous financial year
	<p>KS presented the annual accounts for the 21/22 financial year. The report can be viewed here: https://soasunion.org/about/ourgovernance/</p>
5.	Appointment of the auditor

GS presented the item, setting out that Knox Cropper were being recommended as the auditors for the 22/23 financial year.

The Chair called a vote. Indicative result - **majority vote in favour.**

6. Approval of Affiliations

GS presented the item setting out that SOAS SU is affiliated to NUS UK, NUS Charity and British University College Sport (BUCS).

The Chair called a vote. Indicative results - **majority vote in favour.**

7. Open questions to the Charity Trustees by the Members

GS answered questions from members on behalf of the Charity Trustees.

Motions for Discussion

8. Debate and Amendment Process

The Chair provided an overview of how motions for discussion and amendments will work, stating that all speeches should be no longer than two minutes.

All debates on motions shall proceed as follows:

- the motion proposer makes a speech
- any amendments to the motion shall be raised
- the Chair shall invite a speech against the debate
- the Chair shall balance the number of speeches for and against the debate
- the Chair shall invite any questions and statements relating to the debate and consider any new proposed amendments to the motion
- the proposer of the motion shall have the right to sum up.
- The Chair shall not vote unless in the case of a tie, in which they will cast the deciding vote.

Amendments to the motion shall proceed as follows:

- any amendments to the motion shall be raised after the proposer has spoken
- the Chair shall invite and take a speech against the amendments
- the Chair shall balance the number of speeches for and against the amendments
- the Chair shall leave time for questions and statements before the vote
- Voting on amendments can take place by an online vote within the meeting using a method agreed to by the Chair.
- when all changes have been voted upon, the main motion shall be discussed.

9. Motion One: Sustainable SOAS

VPR (Sustainability Officer) presented the motion, which can be viewed in appendix two.

The Chair called for a speech against. No speech against was requested.

The Chair called for a vote. Indicative result - majority vote in favour.	
10.	Motion Two: Emergency Motion Students Against Securitisation and Surveillance
<p>SL (Students Against Securitisation and Surveillance Officer – SASS Officer) presented the motion, which can be viewed in appendix three.</p> <p>The Chair called for amendments.</p> <p>Amendment One: GR and AH-C proposed an amendment under 3.2 to include the following ‘SOAS Students Union should also enquire about the tendering process for any security contracts, with the SU advocating against outsourcing’</p> <p>Amendment Two: AH-C proposed an amendment, creating a new item under 3.9 ‘SOAS Students’ Union should call for the removal of the current SOAS Head of Security.’</p> <p>The Chair calls for speeches against either of the proposed amendments. No speech against was requested.</p> <p>Amendment three: MZ proposed an amendment, creating a new item under 3.10 ‘Advocate for SOAS Security to wear a different uniform to ensure that students can identify the difference between internal and external security.’</p> <p>The Chair calls for a speech against this amendment. No speech against was requested.</p> <p>The Chair calls for a speech against the motion. No speech against was requested.</p> <p>The Chair asks if the proposer wishes to sum up the motion. The proposer declines.</p> <p>The Chair calls for a vote on amendment one. Indicative result - majority vote in favour.</p> <p>The Chair calls for a vote on amendment two. Indicative result - majority vote in favour.</p> <p>The Chair calls for a vote on amendment three. Indicative result - majority vote in favour.</p> <p>The Chair called for a vote on the motion. Indicative result - majority vote in favour.</p>	
11.	Motion Three: Emergency Motion No Confidence in Welfare and Campaigns Officer

MZ presented the motion, which can be viewed in appendix four.

The Chair called for amendments.

Amendment One:

MZ proposed the following amendments:

3.2 If the vote of no confidence in an elected officer is upheld then the SU will be mandated to do the following:

3.2.1. The Charity Trustees are mandated to conduct an independent investigation into the allegation of misconduct, and should this investigation find misconduct this should be dealt with inline with the relevant HR policies.

3.2.2. The Sabbatical Officer shall be placed on leave until the outcome of the investigation in relation to the alleged misconduct.

3.2.3. If the investigation does not find grounds for dismissal based on misconduct, then the Charity Trustees shall call a referendum in line with the process set out in 11.25 of the Constitution in relation to a vote of no confidence in Sabbatical Officer in their role as a Charity Trustee.

3.2.4. For the avoidance of doubt if the misconduct allegations or referenda are upheld, this shall prevent the Officer from serving a second term.

3.7. For the avoidance of doubt if the misconduct investigation or referenda are upheld, this shall prevent the Officer from serving a second term.

The Chair calls for a speech against an amendment.

HS makes a speech against the amendment stating that the motion should not apply to the second term.

The Chair clarifies that speeches must be about the amendment and that the opportunity to speak against the motion will follow.

SS makes spoke questioning the procedure followed by the SU. The Chair clarifies that they are currently calling for a speech against the amendment and speeches must be no longer than two minutes. SS spoke against the motion. SS questioned the legitimacy of the Vote of No Confidence being submitted as an emergency motion.

An unknown student enquired about who would be responsible for determining if the correct process was followed. The Chair clarifies that the Charity Trustees would be ultimately responsible.

The Chair stated that SS has now spoken for over two minutes and call for a vote on the amendment.

The Chair called for a vote on amendment one. Indicative result - **majority vote in favour.**

The Chair called for further amendments

SS stated that he should have a chance to speak as the motion relates to him. The Chair reiterates that following amendments there will be an opportunity to speak against the motion overall.

HS stated that due process is not being followed, that the claims in 1.1 are baseless and lack evidence and questions the reference to being Dalit in 2.1.

The Chair states that no amendment was proposed and calls for further amendments.

Amendment Two:

EG proposed that the motion be amended to include who was invited and why this should be seen as an issue. The amended is added under 1.9. As the exact wording of the amendment required is unclear this is amended as, 'This has included a former BJP MP and Minister'.

The Chair asked participants not to interrupt and that if it continued the meeting will run out of time.

CMD sought clarification on the exact wording to add to the amendment and asked EG to add the content to the chat function. The vote was taken using the above wording for the amendment.

The Chair called for a speech against EG amendment.

BKA spoke against the amendment, stating that the individual that was invited is part of a constitutional body which protects the rights of Dalits. The Chair asked for wording of the amendment.

Following disruption the Chair called a Chairs Order to move straight to the vote on the amendment.

BKA clarified that they were not proposing an amendment but making a speech against the amendment justifying why the individual was invited.

The Chair called a vote on amendment two. Indicative result - **majority vote in favour.**

The Chair stated they will not be taking any further amendments as the meeting time was coming to a close and invited SS to speak against the motion for two minutes.

Two unknown students requested SS have respect for the chair, and that he should take the opportunity to speak and stop interrupting others.

SS stated the following:

1. The two minute time frame is not sufficient
2. The processes was undemocratic
3. The Chair does not have the power to make this decision
4. He denies the allegations
5. This is part of a political agenda by those who he ran against
6. The BJP member was invited to discuss scholarship opportunities for Dalit's
7. A false statement was made about the Lunar New Year Late License and that he intervened between security and two students who he felt were being intimidated.

The Chair stated that the two minutes is complete and moves to vote. SS reiterated that he has not had enough time to speak, that the process if unfair and undemocratic.

The Chair called a vote on the motion. Indicative vote - **majority vote in favour.**

Close

The Chair thanked the meeting attendees and closed the meeting.

Appendix One: Validated Votes

Vote Number	Vote Title	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Result	Unvalidated votes
1	Meeting Set Up	54	1	n/a	APPROVE	
2	Minutes of the previous meeting	44	1	19	APPROVE	1 reject
3	Appointment of the Auditor	44	3	24	APPROVE	2 abstain

4	Approval of the Affiliations	44	7	19	APPROVE	2 abstain
5	Motion One- Sustainability at SOAS	89	4	9	APPROVE	2 approve
6	Motion Two Amendment One	90	4	7	APPROVE	3 approve
7	Motion Two Amendment Two	84	8	9	APPROVE	2 approve
8	Motion Two Amendment Three	89	8	14	APPROVE	1 approve, 1 abstain, 1 reject
9	Motion Two - Students' Against Securitisation and Surveillance	94	8	4	APPROVE	3 approve
10	Motion Three Amendment One	83	13	4	APPROVE	1 abstain, 1 reject
11	Motion Three Amendment Two	76	16	5	APPROVE	1 approve, 1 reject
12	Motion Three - Vote of No Confidence in the Welfare and Campaigns Officer	89	23	3	APPROVE	1 approve, 1 reject

Appendix Two: Past Motions

Motion One: Sustainable SOAS

Proposer: Vishnu P R (Preferenda Part-Time Officer – Sustainability)

1. This Union Notes:
 - 1.1. Its responsibility for taking immediate action to reduce its environmental impact and create awareness on the significance of practising a sustainable lifestyle (1);
 - 1.2. It's operations and activities contribute to greenhouse gas emissions, waste generation, and resource depletion;
 - 1.3. It should act upon specific goals to prioritise sustainability in the student union's operations and activities, and commits to regular reporting to members and stakeholders on progress towards these goals, thereby acknowledging the importance of environmental sustainability;

2. This Union Believes:
 - 2.1. It has a responsibility to lead by example and to promote sustainable practices among the students, members and the wider community;
 - 2.2. It is committed to develop and implement a sustainability policy that includes measurable targets and actions to reduce the environmental impact wherever possible;
 - 2.3. It will advocate with the university management to give high priority to environmental sustainability and implement significant measures to decrease its environmental impact aligned with the sustainability policy of University of London (2).

3. This Union Resolves:
 - 3.1. Launching all student-led sustainability campaigns, events, and activities under the '#SustainableSOAS' tagline.
 - 3.2. The Co-President Welfare and Campaigns should become responsible for championing and delivering sustainable initiatives and their role description should be updated accordingly.
 - 3.3. The Co-President Welfare and Campaigns should be responsible for putting forward a proposal for a Sustainability Officer in the annual Officer Preferenda selection
 - 3.4. SOAS SU Trustee Board should review the existing Environmental Policy and update to bring in line with sector best practice aligned with relevant decisions made by democratic bodies such as the Preferenda and AGM.
 - 3.5. An operational plan for reducing energy and water consumption in SU facilities and reducing waste generation and increasing recycling/composting.
 - 3.6. Launching a permanent SU 'swap shop' for donating and swapping used good quality clothes.

- 3.7. Collaborating and partnering with other university student union initiatives (3) and sustainability teams for achieving common sustainability targets.
 - 3.8. Implementing 'Green Protocol' (4) in all events and functions conducted by students' union and other student societies.
 - 3.9. Implementing a transparent Ethical Careers Policy that excludes oil, gas, and mining companies from conducting recruitment opportunities within the university (5).
 - 3.10. Sourcing sustainable products and materials for student union operations and student society events.
 - 3.11. Engaging and empowering our members and students on sustainable practices through various campaigns and awareness programs.
 - 3.12. Investigating and implementing appropriate offsetting mechanisms to neutralise any remaining carbon emissions that are unable to eliminate through aforementioned reduction efforts.
 - 3.13. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Student Union will allocate adequate resources and staff time to support the development and implementation of our sustainability policy, and will review and report on our progress towards our sustainability goals to our members and stakeholders at the beginning of every academic year
4. References:
- 4.1. <https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/>
 - 4.2. https://www.london.ac.uk/sites/default/files/file-uploads/2022-03/Sustainability_Policy_2022.pdf
 - 4.3. Policy and Strategy | Sustainable UCL - UCL – University College London
 - 4.4. Policies | Sustainability | The University of Sheffield
 - 4.5. Sustainability Plan - About the University, University of York
 - 4.6. Sustainability policies | University of Surrey
 - 4.7. Strategy and performance | The University of Edinburgh
 - 4.8. <http://haritham.kerala.gov.in/greenprotocol/>
 - 4.9. Fossil Free Careers SU Motion | People & Planet (peopleandplanet.org)

Motion Two: Emergency Motion Students Against Securitisation and Surveillance

Title: SOAS SU to address the over-securitisation of campus

Proposed by: Samuel Landis (691528@soas.ac.uk)

Seconded by: Filippo Angeli (672088@soas.ac.uk)

1. This Union Notes:

- 1.1. According to a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request, from February 2022 to March 2023 SOAS management spent over £650,000 on external security staff. The amount of additional funds spent on internal security have yet to be distributed. This FOI can be found [here](#).
- 1.2. Broken down by month, the aforementioned FOI demonstrates that SOAS spent the highest amounts on external security during months of lawful industrial strike action partaken in by UCU and Unison staff, and during other times of 'heightened risk', including student protests.
- 1.3. In February of 2022, SOAS spent £50,957.50 on external security, and in March of 2022, SOAS spent £46,758.00 on external security staff. From February 23rd to March 3rd of 2022, in the midst of a student occupation of the managerial corridor, SOAS used external security staff to shut down and patrol the main building, restricting students from accessing campus spaces including classrooms, libraries, and the JCR. External security staff was also used to monitor occupiers and outside supporters on a 24-hour timescale. The occupation culminated when an 'eviction response team' of 30+ personnel entered the SOAS campus with riot shields and other gear, climbed the main building with ladders and entered the occupied space by breaking windows, and forcefully removed students from the building — dragging some out by their hands and feet until they reached the back exit. A statement regarding the eviction can be found [here](#).
- 1.4. In September of 2022, SOAS spent £126,610 on external security staff in just 30 days. During the last week of September, external security was used to move the Unison picket line off SOAS property and restrict students in support of the strike from entering campus and distributing flyers. Multiple instances of intimidation and harassment from external security staff were reported to the SU during this time, including one instance of a guard telling a student that they would be "broken in half". In February of 2023, the SOAS SU attempted to deliver a letter to the SOAS Board of Trustees which touched upon multiple student testimonies and complaints regarding external and internal security staff during this time period, but the Board of Trustees removed the letter from their agenda points. When a group of students attempted to deliver the letter to the Board of Trustees themselves, they were confronted with 5-10 security guards in Senate House Library who restricted their entry to the building. This letter can be found [here](#). Further information about external security

presence during September of 2022 can be found [here](#). A statement and video regarding the Senate House Library confrontation can be found [here](#).

- 1.5. In November of 2023, SOAS spent £62,318.50 on external security. In February of 2023, SOAS spent £62,707 on external security, and in March of 2023, SOAS spent £67,913 on external security. UCU staff were on strike for 21 days over the course of these three months. External security staff were used to police the union's picket line, ensure that the picket line did not enter onto the campus, and monitor pro-strike student protests occurring on and near the SOAS campus. Students were prohibited from entering the SOAS JCR with pro-union posters and literature by external security staff.
- 1.6. Multiple student protests spanning February of 2022 to March of 2023, including demonstrations led by the SOAS Justice for Workers Campaign, the SOAS Palestine Society, and SOAS Strike Solidarity, were policed, patrolled, and filmed by external security staff.
- 1.7. According to multiple student testimonies collected by Yara Derbas, Co-President of the SOAS Student Union, external security have made it more difficult for SOAS students, non- SOAS students, and other community members to enter SOAS buildings and utilize SOAS resources. Students are frequently subjected to hostile ID checks, guests of students have been denied entry at adequate entry times, and multiple testimonies have been recorded which document harassment and intimidation (often gendered, racialized, or sexualized in manner) from security guards.
- 1.8. Throughout the course of the 2022-23 academic year, multiple new security apparatuses and infrastructure has been added to the SOAS campus. A new security corridor has been built to monitor student activity across campus, new ID card tracking technology has been implemented at the entrance of the Main Building, and new security cameras have been placed in the JCR and Student Union smoking area.
- 1.9. Throughout the course of the 2021-22 and 2022-23 academic years, late licenses and other student events have been patrolled and monitored by a large amount of external security guards, often ranging from 5-15 guards. Students frequently note feeling uncomfortable and unsafe by the large number of security guards in social spaces.
- 1.10. For at least the last 10 years, SOAS has utilized the counter-terrorism strategy and framework developed by the U.K. government entitled 'Prevent'. Staff are required to undertake 'Prevent' training before undertaking teaching. According to the SOAS group 'SOAS Against Securitisation and Surveillance', formerly 'Preventing Prevent', "prevent identified a 'pre-criminal space', where individuals display signs of radicalisation or 'non-violent extremism'. These indicators are extremely

vague and also raise the possibility of criminalizing political thought. Prevent guidelines regard the following as signs of radicalisation: ‘relevant mental health issues’, ‘desire for a higher purpose’, ‘changing social circles’, ‘criticism of British foreign policy’ and ‘Palestine solidarity activism’”. Prevent further deems anti-social behavior, crying, and using too much technology as risks of terrorist indoctrination. More information about prevent’s role at SOAS can be found [here](#).

- 1.11. In 2009, SOAS colluded with ISS and the Home Office in an effort to crack down on undocumented workers — 9 SOAS cleaners were deported on June 12th of that year, including a woman 6 months pregnant, during a surprise immigration raid which took place at 6am in the DLT. 40 UK border agents sprung from concealed locations and forcefully detained those without valid documents. More information about this event can be found [here](#).
- 1.12. SOAS management have undertaken multiple attempts to cleanse student spaces of artwork, political messaging, and information about upcoming events. In the 2021-22 academic year, nearly half of the student artwork that has covered the walls of the Student Union bar was covered over with white paint in the midst of the student occupation. The walls were repeatedly covered throughout the year as students tried to draw new artwork. At the beginning of the 2022-23 academic year, much of the artwork and drawings covering the outdoor SU smoking area were removed, and have continued to be removed throughout the year. At the start of the 2022-23 academic year, students were prohibited from distributing flyers and hanging flyers up on the Student Union walls by external security.
- 1.13. On November 5th, 2022, a student was physically removed by two security guards for asking a question about Adam Habib’s history at Wits University in South Africa at a book talk in the Paul Webley Wing. A link to the video of this event can be found [here](#).
- 1.14. Throughout the 2022-23 academic year, state agencies, including the Metropolitan Police, have engaged in operations on the SOAS campus. On February 6th, 2022, a SOAS student was forcefully arrested by 8 police officers on the SOAS campus in front of multiple SOAS student and staff members. The arrest was very violent; the student was restrained on the ground for minutes while screaming and thrown into the back of a police van. No officers informed any students where the arrestee was being taken or what would happen to them. SOAS security did not appear to intervene in the arrest.
- 1.15. A talk planned with musician Kgomotso Moshugi from Wits University in South Africa planned for March 20th was canceled under pressure from SOAS management. The planned topic was the ‘Fees Must Fall’ protest movement in South Africa, which started at Wits University,

where SOAS's current director Adam Habib was Vice Chancellor. Habib undertook a violent response to student protestors and stationed large amounts of security forces and police officers on campus, resulting in multiple violent arrests and beatings. The Co-President of Wits's student union was shot with rubber bullets over 10 times, and multiple students were imprisoned without bail. More information about Habib's previous history of using securitisation to undermine student protest can be found [here](#).

- 1.16. Multiple UCU members have reported that pro-union posters hanging outside of their office have been removed.
2. This Union Believes:
 - 2.1. As SOAS faces a budgeting crisis, spending £650,000 on security in one year is an excessive and unnecessary expenditure.
 - 2.2. SOAS markets itself on a 'decolonising agenda' and uses the social and political activism occurring on campus to encourage students to enroll at SOAS. This is evident in paid articles which SOAS published on the Guardian's website, found [here](#). This article in particular mentions the SOAS Justice for Workers campaign's response to the 2009 deportation mentioned above. Using political protests and occupations as a way to market SOAS to students while simultaneously spending £650,000 on external security — largely used to police student protests, including protests led by the Justice for Workers Campaign — is not only misleading, but also manipulative and harmful.
 - 2.3. Using external security to prohibit workers from some of the United Kingdom's largest trade unions from striking and forming picket lines on university property is a blatant attempt to delegitimise the pressing concerns of staff who work tirelessly to make our university functional.
 - 2.4. The multiple attempts of SOAS to gauge the 'voices' of the student body through surveys, petitions, and paid 'student voice' positions become irrelevant when students are prevented from speaking and existing freely on their campus. At the start of the 2022-23 school year, SOAS spent thousands of pounds on a survey to ask students their thoughts and opinions of direct action. The results of the survey have yet to be released, and should be immediately.
 - 2.5. Overall, a highly securitised SOAS seeks to target marginalised groups on campus, suppress resistance and radicalism, and uphold the colonised and marketised foundations which our university rests upon. Our university must be de-securitised and de-surveilled in an effort to foster a freely accessible SOAS where students and non-students can feel liberated to learn, talk and exist without fear of retribution from dominative structures of power seeking to undermine our identities.
3. This Union Resolves:

- 3.1. The SOAS Student Union will commit to fighting for de-securitisation and de-surveillance throughout the 2023-24 school year. They will adopt the above points as their official position on securitisation at SOAS.
- 3.2. The SOAS Student Union will engage in direct discussions with management to make the above points heard and work to decrease the amount of money our university is spending on internal and external security. The SOAS Student Union will provide an overview of alternative funding priorities that money used to fund external security can be distributed into. SOAS Students' Union should also enquire about the tendering process for any security contracts, with the SU advocating against outsourcing
- 3.3. The SOAS Student Union will work closely with the 'Students Against Securitisation and Surveillance' SU Part-Time Officer and 'Students Against Securitisation and Surveillance' student group to work towards a de-securitised and de-surveilled SOAS, and make their message known throughout the university. The SOAS Student Union will ensure that the 'Students Against Securitisation and Surveillance' student group does not face threats or intimidation from the university and SOAS management.
- 3.4. The SOAS Student Union will collect student testimonials throughout the 2023-24 school year regarding experiences with security staff. This effort will be managed by the 'Students Against Securitisation and Surveillance' SU Part-Time Officer.
- 3.5. The SOAS Student Union will support students under threat by securitisation and surveillance, including student protestors threatened with disciplinary action from the university. The SOAS Student Union will ensure students do not face threats from security when handing out flyers and engaging in political discussion on campus.
- 3.6. The SOAS Student Union will try to lessen the number of security officials present at student events and late licenses, and petition for security officials to be trained in 'Enough is Enough' training if they are to work student events. Ideally, the SOAS Student Union will try to increase the amount of 'Enough is Enough' officers at student events that can take the place of security officials.
- 3.7. The SOAS Student Union will resist further refurbishments to SU spaces which seek to erase student artwork and political thought.
- 3.8. The SOAS Student Union will continue to monitor SOAS's 'Prevent' activities to ensure no student is wrongfully incriminated for their behavior.

Title: Emergency Motion of No Confidence in the Current and Upcoming Welfare and Campaigns Sabbatical Officer, Sushant Singh

Proposed by: Matthew Zimmer (694792@soas.ac.uk)

Seconded by: Viktor Uteng Da Silva (680654@soas.ac.uk)

1. This Union Notes:

- 1.1. The allegations of sexual harassment involving the present Welfare and Campaigns Officer, Sushant Singh.
- 1.2. The lack of action taken by the Student Union to address these allegations.
- 1.3. These unaddressed allegations have inhibited the work of the Student Union and harmed external relations
- 1.4. Concerns regarding the current Welfare and Campaigns Officer's accountability and failure to fulfill campaign promises (i.e. commitment to fighting Islamophobia on campus 'Boycott against the faculty for using derogatory words or statements in their private/ public life', 'Campaign for Justice for workers and subsidies fees for their children')
- 1.5. Instances of Sushant Singh overstepping his role and encroaching on the responsibilities of other staff members (i.e. taking on the dedicated welfare-officers at the Lunar New Year late license)
- 1.6. The neglect of numerous allegations raised by students, indicating a lack of response, accountability, and leadership failure.
- 1.7. Breaches of conduct and suppressed allegations, as well as inadequate investigation of previous and recent complaints.
- 1.8. Troubling political affiliations of the current Sabbatical Officer, particularly with the BJP (Bharatiya Janata Party) and representing the British High Commission of India in the House of Lords. This has included a former BJP MP and Minister.
- 1.9. The potential conflicts of interest and compromise to the Union's vision and strategy resulting from these affiliations.

2. This Union Believes:

- 2.1. Despite Sushant's marginalised background as a Dalit man and condemn any form of caste-based violence. However, his conduct irrespective of his background has proven to align himself with individuals who propagate the very violence he opposes. The allegations of sexual harassment and the lack of adequate action are unacceptable and require immediate attention.
- 2.2. The current Welfare and Campaigns Officer, Sushant Singh, has demonstrated a lack of accountability and failure to fulfill their responsibilities.
- 2.3. The overstepping of roles, neglect of allegations, and breaches of conduct undermine the integrity and effectiveness of the Student Union.

- 2.4. The troubling political affiliations of the Sabbatical Officer contradict the values of the Student Union and compromise impartial representation (directly violate clause 12.b, I and II of the constitution of the SOAS Students' Union)
3. **This Union Resolves:**
 - 3.1. To pass a vote of no confidence in the current Welfare and Campaigns Officer and Sabbatical Officer, Sushant Singh
 - 3.2. If the vote of no confidence in an elected officer is upheld then the SU will be mandated to do the following:
 - 3.2.1. The Charity Trustees are mandated to conduct an independent investigation into the allegation of misconduct, and should this investigation find misconduct this should be dealt with inline with the relevant HR policies.
 - 3.2.2. The Sabbatical Officer shall be placed on leave until the outcome of the investigation in relation to the alleged misconduct.
 - 3.2.3. If the investigation does not find grounds for dismissal based on misconduct, then the Charity Trustees shall call a referendum in line with the process set out in 11.25 of the Constitution in relation to a vote of no confidence in Sabbatical Officer in their role as a Charity Trustee.
 - 3.2.4. For the avoidance of doubt if the misconduct allegations or referenda are upheld, this shall prevent the Officer from serving a second term.
 - 3.3. To urge all members of the Student Union to support this motion.
 - 3.4. To take prompt action to address the concerns raised by students, including the allegations of sexual harassment and the lack of accountability.
 - 3.5. To reaffirm the commitment to impartiality and inclusivity in the Student Union's representation.
 - 3.6. To safeguard the integrity of the Student Union by addressing potential conflicts of interest and compromising affiliations.