Agenda of a Meeting of the Graduate Union Council
7.00 pm, Monday 21st October, SU Lounge, 17 Mill Lane, CB2 1RX

1. Objections to the Order of Items on the Agenda
   a. Chairing of items 6a-c

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Council Meeting (Paper 1019.B)

3. Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Council Meeting
   a. Ratification of resolutions of the previous meeting

4. Reports from Sabbatical Officers and Officers of the Executive Committee
   a. Report from the President (Verbal Report)
   b. Report from the Vice-President (Verbal Report)
   c. Report from the Welfare & Rights Officer (Verbal Report)
   d. Report from the Campaigns committee (Verbal Report)

5. Dates of Elections for the Graduate Union 2019-20 (Paper 1019.C, carried forward from the previous Council)
   a. Appointment of the GU representative to the Elections Committee (Paper to be tabled at Council)

6. Ordinary Motions to Council
   a. Motion to Mandate the Graduate Union to endorse a Referendum concerning the Proposals on a New Single Students’ Union (Paper 1019.D, Paper 1019.K and Paper 1019.L)
   b. Motion to Mandate the Graduate Union to urge the University to set up Scholarship Programmes to support Home BME postgraduate students. (Paper 1019.E)
   c. Motion to Support Transparent and Accessible Funding (Paper 1019.F)
   d. Motion to Support Fair & Equal Pay (Paper 1019.G, carried forward from the previous Council)
   e. Motion on Training for Good Supervision (Paper 1019.H, carried forward from the previous Council)
   f. Motion on Post-Study Work Visas (Paper 1019.I)
g. Motion to Oppose University's Neglect of Sexual Misconduct (Paper 1019.J)

7. Emergency Motions

8. Election of the 2019-20 Council Chair

9. Dates of Upcoming Meetings
   a. Monday 2nd December, 7pm, SU Lounge
   b. NB that a referendum on the new students’ union would refer a general meeting to be held in November.

10. Any Other Business
Minutes – GU Council on 2/09/19

Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orla Woodward</td>
<td>Jesus College MCR, VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Ippolito</td>
<td>Pembroke College GP, External Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Parker Humphreys</td>
<td>CUSU, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Mellon</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam College MCR, VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone de Rijk</td>
<td>Clare Hall GSB, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Prestil</td>
<td>Darwin College, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Deasy</td>
<td>Magdalene College MCR, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Whitaker</td>
<td>Clare College MCR, VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Swain</td>
<td>GU, Welfare &amp; Rights Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro Ceccarelli</td>
<td>GU, President and Acting Chair of Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Tregear</td>
<td>Trinity College &amp; CUCU Exec, voting as a proxy for Tamzin Byrne, Murray Edwards MCR President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verner Viisainen</td>
<td>Pembroke College GP President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess O’Brien</td>
<td>CUSU, Disabled Students’ Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efthimios Karayiannides</td>
<td>Magdalene College MCR, VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Chahine</td>
<td>GU, General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Kite</td>
<td>GU, Postgraduate Engagement Coordinator and minute-taker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The President welcomed the attendees to the first council of the new GU team, and welcomed CUSU representatives to the meeting. The attendees introduced themselves to the room.

It was noted that the meeting was not quorate, but that the council would proceed anyway, taking indicative votes where appropriate.

1. Objections to the Order of Items on the Agenda

The Council agreed to move item 7d. to be taken after item 6, in order to allow a smoother discussion of the proposals.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Council Meeting

One comment was received in advance from the Murray Edwards MCR President amending the minutes regarding the proposal for a new union. The unconfirmed minutes had recorded that students at Murray Edwards had a negative impression of the new SU project, when in fact they are generally happy to move forward with the proposals. The intended point had been that some students have been overwhelmed by the complexity of the situation and so had disengaged from the consultation process.

There were no other comments on the minutes.

3. Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Council Meeting

a. Ratification of resolutions of the previous meeting

As the meeting was inquorate, the resolutions of the previous meeting could not be ratified.

4. Reports from Sabbatical Officers and Officers of the Executive Committee

a. Report from the President (Verbal Report)

It has been a busy summer with University meetings, team management of the GU, and student facing projects falling into the following five categories:

- The Postgraduate Experience
- Stronger Voice for Students
- Access and Participation
- Equality and Diversity

On the postgraduate experience, the President had been working on reviewing self-evaluation on CamSIS, improved and possibly mandatory training for supervisions at both undergraduate and postgraduate level, preventative strategies for PhD student welfare, and the GU was running a panel series on students’ experiences of fieldwork.

Work was ongoing on improving the student voice at a University level, especially within the Equality & Diversity portfolio, and significant amounts of work had also been undertaken on the proposals for a new Students’ Union. (See item 6)

On Access & Participation, recruitment would begin soon for a new officer working at a University level specifically on postgraduate widening participation for the first time, and the GU had begun collaborating with the University on improving the system for allocating and allocating funding via a single, central, accessible portal.

Regarding Equality & Diversity, it was hoped that confirmation would soon be received of a new committee at University level for Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation, and conversations had been started with the Cambridge Centre for Teaching and Learning on a project on diversifying curricula.

The President had also been working on promoting awareness of the Students’ Unions’ Advice Service among postgraduate students, and on improving the relationship the GU has with academic reps.

b. Report from the Vice-President

A written report was received from the Vice-President. His campaigns work included:
Three campaigns are to be launched on these themes. The housing and Graduate Rights campaigns have been ongoing pieces of work for the GU for some time, and included work with UCU on a number of issues around pay and supervision. The new campaign, CREATE, will concern unconscious bias, improving the awareness of issues faced by BME students and empowering the GU’s BME Officer role.

c. **Report from the Welfare & Rights Officer (Verbal Report)**

The Welfare & Rights Officer has been starting her role with training and beginning her main campaigns:

- Support for student sex workers
  - Also linking into national campaigns on sex work
- Working with UCU on Raise the Bar and the gender pay gap
- Supporting survivors of sexual violence, especially in the light of recent events relating to the university disciplinary procedure
- Anti-racist campaigns including raising awareness of racism in Cambridge, and a standardised central racial harassment policy. Her Part-Time Executive Officer from the CUSU BME Campaign was also a part of this work.
- Opposing Prevent, which is racist legislation that disproportionately affects Muslim and BME students

She is also setting up events for the next term and working with the GU Families Officer on supporting student families and parents at the university, in particular with childcare and university cards for partners of students.

d. **Report from the Campaigns committee (Verbal Report)**

Campaign funds from the GU can be applied for by members. Money assigned last year to Laura Gomez is being used to set up a panel series in November on issues related to PGR students and fieldwork. She is currently looking for panel chairs and speakers for those events, and attendees were invited to get in touch if interested.

The UCU graduate representative encouraged representatives to participate in the UCU Raise the Bar campaign, and distributed materials to attendees. The Raise the Bar campaign ties together anti-casualisation work between different unions. For graduate students it is about greater transparency about allocation of teaching to avoid patronage, guaranteeing contracts for teaching staff to increase security. It also involves postdocs and other precarious staff.

The Pembroke GP External Rep asked the WARO whether there would be projects based on the Mental Health survey conducted last year happening this year. The WARO said that this would be something she would be keen to pursue, working with the CUSU DSO. The President added that the report is available online, that representatives could use it in their campaigning, and that the GU was currently making use of it in campaigns including one motion later today. It would also feed into the CREATE campaign and the University Race Equality Chartermark committee. Its findings about mental health in the LGBTQ community would be a project for the likely new GISOC in the coming months.
5. Items for Discussion

a. Opportunities for informal discussion between MCR and JCR Representatives

The room was invited to comment on ways to improve the relationship between the GU and MCRs with JCRs. This was a short term project, not looking ahead to the new union but to this year. CUSU run a successful college forum which is open to JCRs and MCRs, and the President wanted to solicit opinions on what would be useful.

The Pembroke GP External Rep said that MCRs would be more likely to participate in the College Forum if it were joint CUSU-GU. The CUSU President said that he was keen to have more MCRs attend, and that he hoped to work more to directly reach out to MCRs as their attendance was valued and had been useful.

The Fitzwilliam College MCR VP said that informal working with their JCR was frequent, but there was no structure for this. The feeling was echoed the Magdalene College MCR President. At Pembroke there were joint meetings between the college and the JCR and MCR twice a term, and these were felt to work well for college issues. These meetings had also led to a better relationship outside of formal structures with college.

The GU President reported that the unions were also working on joint forums and training for academic reps and that this would dovetail with plans for MCRs. One issue with this was that there were ever more platforms for discussion, and that the college forum could be one more. There was a worry that for PG students the frequency of these meetings could be too much. UG students also tend to meet only within term times, while PG students work all year round, so there is an issue of compromise between the two students.

The CUSU DSO raised that many UG students, such as estranged and disabled students, do stay here all year and can also be isolated, so the Unions running events in the vacations could be a very positive thing for those students.

The Jesus College MCR President said that these meetings should not be too often as this can dilute the number of people that attend, and suggested once per term.

The CUSU President said that while College Forum meets 4 times per term in Michaelmas and Lent and twice in Easter it is very informal and people were encouraged to attend when they have items to discuss, which was often on an ad hoc issue-focused basis. They are also time-limited and worked quite well as a social occasion and opportunity to mix between common rooms. He agreed it would be worth looking at running some events outside term focused on PG issues, as with academic forum.

The Clare Hall GSB President asked if votes can be held at meetings held outside term. It was clarified that the meetings function in parallel to GU Council so they are more informal, and there is less need to vote on issues. A compromise has been reached with academic forum which includes meetings in term and specific PG meetings in the vacations.

6. Update on GU-CUSU project on a “New Union”

The President gave an update on work on developing proposals for a New Union.
• There have been working groups to discuss aspects of the new project, which was complex. It has been an eventful month with improvements on many aspects.

• There have been some changes to aspects of the original proposals.
  - Discussions on the structure of the new union have looked to find a compromise between the two existing unions, as well as taking opportunities to do things in new and more efficient ways.
  - On sabbatical officers, there was no change from the original plan.
  - There had been discussion about the Executive, particularly the liberation campaigns. Within the GU there are Executive Officers with portfolios, whereas CUSU have a model of sabbatical-led teams and semi-autonomous campaigns. We have reached an agreed structure which is more similar to CUSU, while working on mechanisms to include PG students as co-leaders in these campaigns. This would empower the existing officers while giving them more resources including staff time, funding and volunteers.
  - Different models for the council have been explored including one council, two councils and hybrids of the above. There has been an appetite for a shared council, as recent years have shown good constructive collaboration between JCR and MCR representatives. The new council will include JCR and MCR reps, student reps from the councils of the schools, and the sabbatical officers and executive of the new union. The details of this council are still to be resolved, but it will be balanced between undergraduates and postgraduates.
  - An early draft of the constitution has been prepared which will be shared with students for consultation once it is ready.
  - The GU’s Board of Trustees has discussed the plans, and there was consensus that this is a positive project. They have scrutinised and approved the business case for the new union as well as the draft democratic structure.

• There are also risks to the project, including some areas that still need more work, in particular to guarantee the representation of PGs in the council, exec and campaigns. The work being done this year on forums is part of this.
  - There is need to finalise agreement on the structure as well as to polish the constitution.
  - More work is needed on the process of conducting the merger to safeguard the GU team and maintain accountability.
  - Welfare, functionality and sustainability of the GU team are also concerns as this is a complex project taking a lot of work, and will continue to be so. There is also a small sacrifice of work on postgraduate issues this year while resources are spent on the project, but it is hoped that this will pay off in the longer term.

The Magdalene College MCR President raised concerns about the safeguarding the voice of postgraduate in the council of the new union. The GU President confirmed that this concern was shared by others, and that the working group was exploring mechanisms with quoracy and the voting system to ensure that postgraduates had a strong voice in the new union. The CUSU President added that engaging MCRs in council was something CUSU had historically
done badly, but the experience of recent councils was that with targeted engagement MCRs were engaging much more. The new union also had the potential to increase turnout from MCRs at council by eliminating duplication of meetings.

The Magdalene College MCR President raised a concern about the amount of business that the new Council might have to consider, and asked about what could be done to streamline this. The GU President confirmed that this was being considered, and that scenario testing would be undertaken to ensure this would not be a problem. College and academic forum will also take some discussions elsewhere so that council becomes more focused. The CUSU DSO raise that there was also scope for reducing duplication here as there would be closer working between undergraduate and postgraduate executive officers.

The concerns were shared by others in the room, and the GU President committed to raise them with the working group at its next meeting. The Pembroke College GP External Rep asked whether quoracy could vary between motions to ensure that decisions were made representing the appropriate groups of students. It was felt that this might be overly complex, but it would be raised with the working group.

The Fitzwilliam College MCR VP asked if students are affiliated research institutes would be represented by the council members from the schools. The GU President confirmed that they would, and agreed that finding ways to better include these would be important.

7. Ordinary Motions to Council

a. Motion to Support Fair & Equal Pay

The Welfare & Rights Officer spoke in favour of this motion, which was to be viewed in the context of an upcoming UCU ballot on issues including pay, contract, gender pay gap and workloads. She reported that all these issues affect PGs who teach, some disproportionately.

- There has been a large real terms pay cut in the HE sector, and the gender pay gap in Cambridge is worse than the sector average.
- There are ongoing links between the GU and Cambridge UCU which have been good and the GU should continue to support them more.
- The GU has a standing Memorandum of Understanding with CUCU from Michaelmas Term 2018, an existing policy on fair pay and another on supporting graduate students as workers.
- There is precedent for working with UCU and we should support them in the ballot and, in the event of its success, to support them in industrial action.

The CUCU PG rep expressed gratitude for the proposal of the motion, and explained that this ballot was one of two ballots running concurrently, one on pay and the other on the USS pension scheme. The pay and equality ballot is a new issue and especially resonant for postgraduates, but it is closely connected to the USS issue. In order for the ballot to be successful there must be a 50% participation rate, which did not happen on the previous ballot, but this time the UCU branch will find out how many people in Cambridge voted on the issues. This will be a strong tool in future negotiations, even if the ballot is not a national success.

The Pembroke College GP External Rep expressed surprise that there was a gender pay gap among students who work. The GU President agreed that this was unacceptable and reported that this was something that the university was now considering through its gender pay gap committee. There would hopefully be additional student reps on this committee.

The Magdalene College MCR President raised a question about whether this included only university employees or students too, and whether there were discrepancies
within departments. It clarified that this ballot was only about university work, but that the issues also stretched to college work and there were gender pay gaps at every level.

An indicative vote was taken on the motion:
In favour: 10
Abstentions: 0
Against: 0

b. Motion on Training for Good Supervision (see also Appendix A: Campaign for Supervisor Training)

The GU President spoke in favour of this motion, which related to an earlier question about how the GU was using data from the mental health survey. These data along with other sources were used to prepare the report in Appendix 1 of the papers. This motion looks at preventative strategy to support students in problems caused by supervision, and was being pursued alongside improvements to reactive services. The aim is to shift the narrative to one shared responsibility between students and supervisions, including by introducing comprehensive training for supervisors to better fulfil their obligations with respect to career development the code of practice etc.

There will also be consultation on what sorts of training would be useful and valuable to be taken back to the university.

The Clare MCR VP raised scepticism about whether supervisors would be likely to engage with any training, as there was no culture of training being desired. The GU President shared this concern, as it is difficult to create a cultural change. The GU is looking at compulsory training but there need to be intermediate steps to that point to bring people with the campaign raising awareness and approaching the issue more softly. Concerns remained, especially with respect to more established members of staff and their willingness to participate. The Council agreed that this was the right approach, and that culture change would take time and was likely to begin with new supervisors.

The Pembroke GP External asked if action could be taken to help existing and future students by describing and setting expectations, in addition to focussing on supervisors. The GU President confirmed that other preventative strategies to support PGR students were being explored, such as workshops to raise awareness and provide resources to help with career development, and accessing support. This should help to provide this early in their student experience rather than when it is too late, to help shift culture and expectations.

An indicative vote was taken on the motion:
In favour: 10
Abstentions: 0
Against: 0

c. Motion in Solidarity with Kashmir

The Welfare & Rights Officer spoke in favour of this motion. The current situation in Kashmir was that Indian government had revoked legislation giving special status to Kashmir, and there had been a shutdown of movement and communications in Kashmir. Groups around the world had reacted in solidarity with this, and as a Union representing students from all around the world we should join them. Implementing
the motion would mean raising awareness, supporting student campaigns on this issue, and making a public statement on our commitment on this issue. Attendees were encouraged to look in to the issue using the resources provided in the question.

The Pembroke College GP President questioned the Council's mandate to make a political statement on a human rights issue, since the GU which is supposed to be focussed on PG students in Cambridge, and expressed concern that this might set a precedent for the GU taking issues on any number of global issues. The Welfare & Rights Officer confirmed that she would be supportive of more motions on international issues that Council believed students should be aware of. This motion would mandate actions focussed on awareness and supporting student campaigns already existing on this issue.

The Magdalene College MCR President gave his support for the actions proposed in the motion, but expressed concern about singling out the Indian government for criticism, suggesting it would be better for the motion to focus on positive support.

The Pembroke College GP President suggested that it was inappropriate for the GU to take sides on this issue and that it should instead focus on providing information so that people can make decisions themselves. The Welfare & Rights Officer cautioned that the Council should avoid false equivalence when two sides are not equal, and that on this issue the situation was sufficiently severe that she would support the Council taking a side. As a representative body the council did have a mandate to represent students on this issue.

The Magdalene College MCR VP suggested that the motion might be amended to focus on solidarity with other students, which might allow us to make that statement less explicitly political as we are simply taking a position of solidarity with groups we have a link with. The Fitzwilliam College MCR VP agreed that this was often effective.

The Murray Edwards MCR President had expressed in written comments that she believed that this issue did lie outside the charitable purpose of the GU, and agreed with suggestions that it would be better to look to the effect of the situation on the GU’s members.

The Welfare & Rights Officer clarified that the intention had been to express solidarity with students, but that as there was a communications blackout in Kashmir details of the impact on students had been hard to obtain.

The GU President suggested that the motion should be amended so as to clarify geographically that not all of Kashmir is in India, as some of the region is in Pakistan and some is in China. The relevant region of India is Jammu and Kashmir, but he acknowledged talking in these terms is politically difficult as it involves an implied stance on the legitimacy of India rule over Kashmir.

It was agreed this was a healthy discussion and that it would be good to include a broader community by asking representatives to engage with their constituencies on this issue. A vote would be deferred to the next meeting of Council.

d. **Motion to Mandate the Graduate Union to Continue Working with the Cambridge University Students’ Union (CUSU) on Consultation on and Development of Proposals for a New Single Union**

The motion was not taken as the meeting was inquorate.

8. **Emergency Motions**

There were no emergency motions.
9. Election of the 2019-20 Council Chair

Nominations were requested for the role of GU Council Chair. The Council agreed that filling this position was important as having a neutral chair was healthy. One nomination had been received remotely, and the council agreed to defer voting to the next meeting in order to hear from the candidates and allow time for more nominations to be sought.

10. Dates of Elections for the Graduate Union 2019-20

The council received the electoral scheme for elections during the Michaelmas Term. A returning officer will be appointed by the next council on the nomination of the Executive Committee after its next meeting.

The Council approved the electoral scheme.

11. Call for Nominations to be co-opted by the Executive Committee

   a. BME Officer
   b. Faculty Liaison Officer
   c. Open Portfolio Officer
   d. Mature Undergraduates Officer

Nominations were being sought to fill vacant roles on the Executive Committee. Co-opted candidates would be in post until the newly elected candidates took office in January 2012. Role descriptions and information will be circulated to the Council and included in the GU bulletin.

12. Dates of Upcoming Meetings

   a. 21st October 2019, 7pm

13. Any Other Business

The UCU Grad Rep reported that UCU were looking to make progress on environmental issues with the University this term, and were preparing an open letter to the VC in advance of the climate strike calling for him to support the climate strike. It was hoped that the GU would be able to offer its support. This issue would be raised with the Executive Committee.

Workshops for MCRs and Academic Reps

- There will be a full calendar of GU-organised workshops and training for MCRs and academic reps of the next few terms, which it is hoped will be useful to council members. A timetable will be prepared and circulated over the coming weeks, which will be mixture of forums, issue based workshops and also training. Attendees were asked for topic suggestions and to help promote these events.
- The CUSU President also raised that College Forum will run fortnightly during Michaelmas term, and asked for suggestions for college-based issues that would be productive themes for meetings.

1 In a change since the meeting of Council, nominations are no longer being sought for a BME Officer. Information about available positions can be found here: https://www.gradunion.cam.ac.uk/news/exec-coopt-09-19
Dates of Elections for the Graduate Union, 2019-20

The Graduate Union resolves:

1. That the GU hold an election for the Part-Time Officers in accordance with the electoral scheme, who will take up office on 1st January 2020

2. That a Returning Officer be appointed at the October council on the 21st October, and that those interested in holding this position should apply to the executive committee by 14th October at 5pm, who will make a recommendation to council

3. That the position of Vice-President should be elected in the Lent Term Elections

4. That following power laid out in the constitution, that the meeting is asked to delegate responsibility for the election to the Cambridge University Students’ Union (CUSU) elections committee and consent for the election to be governed by CUSU electoral rules and procedures. The Graduate Union Returning Officer shall be a member of the CUSU Elections Committee for this purpose.

   • Nominations open: 24 Oct
   • Nominations close: 12 Nov
   • Candidates briefing: 13 Oct
   • Campaigning opens: 15 Nov
   • Voting closes and results announcement: 21 Nov

The Offices up for elections will be as follows:

• Faculty Liaison Officer
• Families Officer
• International Officer
• BME Officer
• LGBTQ+ Officer
• Environmental Officer
• Disabilities Officer
• Women’s Officer
• Open Portfolio (e.g. housing, finances)
## Electoral Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 2nd September →</td>
<td>GU Council Summer 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th October →</td>
<td>Call for nominations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 11th November →</td>
<td><em>Division of term</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline to receive electoral roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 12th November →</td>
<td>Mich. elections nominations close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 13th November→</td>
<td>Candidates briefing from the EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign Team briefing from the EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 15th November →</td>
<td>Campaigning opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 18th November →</td>
<td>Voting Opens in Referendum &amp; Mich. elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaigning Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 21st November →</td>
<td>Voting closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announce provisional results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motion to Mandate the Graduate Union to initiate the process to activate a Referendum concerning the Proposals for a New Single Students’ Union

*Updated version of the motion presented at meeting in July 2019*

**Proposer:** Alessandro Ceccarelli, President and Chair, Graduate Union (henceforth GU)

**Seconder:** Mrittunjoy Guha Majumdar, Chair of Exec and Vice-president, Graduate Union

**The Graduate Union notes:**

1. That extensive consultation and proposal development has been undertaken in the past months on joint proposals from the GU and CUSU on the creation of a new students’ union;

2. See Appendix A. That 51 undergraduate and 93 postgraduate students responded to our recent survey. 90% of undergraduate respondents supported CUSU and the GU working more closely together and 78% supported the proposal for a single union. Of postgraduate respondents, 86% supported CUSU and the GU working more closely together and 65% supported the proposal for a single union. Between 73 and 75% of postgraduate respondents supported the proposed sabbatical, executive committee and council and forum structures. Between 60% and 75% of undergraduate respondents supported the same proposed structures. Undergraduate respondents were most supportive of the proposed council and forum structures;

3. That the proposal have been modified in order to respond to areas of concern. For instance, concerns were raised about the proposed access and education roles, an LGBT+ role, and the need for an equal postgraduate voice in any new council and forum structures. These and more requests and concerns have been actively addressed at GU-CUSU working group meetings and a new updated proposal has been developed so as to meet a compromise between the needs and requests of UG and PG students (See Appendix B);

4. That in July, August, September and October 2019 the GU and CUSU Sabbatical officers and members of staff have consistently and successfully undertaken positive and constructive conversations to improve the proposal so as to promote better representation of PG students with a ‘New Single Students’ Union’ (henceforth ‘New-SU’);

5. That MCRs and Postgraduate student representatives have been kept informed during the proposal developments and their voices, needs and concerns have been presented to the GU-CUSU working group, as well as discussed and integrated in the proposal as far as possible. (see paper 1019.L);

6. That a Business Case was formalised and presented to, and accepted by the Trustees of each charity (ie. CUSU and GU);

7. That discussions with the GU Board of Trustees have been conducted so as to guarantee the interests of the GU Charity;

---

GU Council - Combined Papers
21/10/19
The Graduate Union believes:

1. That we need to continue to engage with students and to endorse a Referendum concerning the ‘New-SU’ to be presented to the University of Cambridge student community;

2. Since postgraduate students make up half the student body, and a majority of postgraduates are international students, we must develop a ‘New-SU’ structure, procedures and mission statements that ensures parity of PG and UG students, as well as home and international students;

3. That the current GU and CUSU sabbatical teams (2019/20) should continue the current direction of travel and campaign to raise awareness of this positive initiative among the student population until a Referendum is held;

The Graduate Union resolves:

1. To endorse a Referendum concerning the ‘New-SU’ to be presented to the University of Cambridge students community in Michaelmas Term 2019;

2. To campaign in favour of the ‘New-SU’ project and raise awareness among the student population until a Referendum is held.
Appendix A: Report from the GU-CUSU Proposal Consultation

GU-CUSU Proposal Consultation - Students (PG)

Q15 - Student status:

- Tripods
- Clinical
- PhD
- MPhil
- PGCE
- Other Master's

Q9 - Do you support the concept of a new single union?

- Definitely yes
- Somewhat yes
- Unsure
- Somewhat no
- Definitely not

Q2 - Do you support the proposed sabbatical structure and roles?

- Definitely yes
- Somewhat yes
- Unsure
- Somewhat no
- Definitely not

Q8 - Do you support the proposed executive committee structure?

- Definitely yes
- Somewhat yes
- Unsure
- Somewhat no
- Definitely not

Q4 - Do you support the proposed council and forum structure?

- Definitely yes
- Somewhat yes
- Unsure
- Somewhat no
- Definitely not

.Count
Appendix B: Some students’ requests concerning the ‘New-SU’

(Students’ signatures not included below)

**MCR’s requests concerning the new single union, “New-SU” project (2019/20)**

The following lists of suggestions and requests are crucial elements that we would like to include in the Constitution of the new single union currently designed by GU and CUSU. The following requests have been presented by MCR Officers and by GU Exec Officers, and aim to improve and guarantee the representation of Postgraduate (PG) and Mature Undergraduate (UG) students.

**Trustees of the New Union:**
- Two or maximum four trustees out of ten should be sabbatical officers, and 50% of them should be equally PG and UG. This structure will guarantee the best support to sabbatical officers and will guarantee equal representation.
- If non-sabbatical students Trustees are appointed, they should also be 50% UG and 50% PG.

**Council, voting and quoracy:**
- In order to guarantee equal representation and voices of PG and UG at the Council, structural mechanisms should be in place. Both the quoracy and the voting system should be structured in ways that guarantee equal representation.
- There must be an ‘electoral college system’, whereby the membership of the Council is divided into two groups (‘undergrads’ and ‘postgrads’) which must give approval/vote individually for a motion. In addition to this, the council as a whole must provide its approval for the motion, (this would however be done in practice in one vote).
- There must also be a quorum of PG and UG representatives present in order for a vote to go ahead and be binding – exact numbers would depend on the membership of the council.

**Structure and representation:**
- There must be equal structural co-leadership (UG and PG) of executive portfolios and campaigns (e.g. ‘liberation campaigns’).
- The frequency and workload of informal and formal platforms (e.g. Academic Forum, College Forum, and Councils) must take into account PG v UG cultures equally. Excessive numbers of informal meetings for MCR representatives may generate confusion and may dilute the overall energy of student representatives.
- We suggest to host a maximum of one extra informal discussion meeting for MCR reps per month (e.g. one informal College Forum per month).
- We request at least one or two Fora or Councils per year dedicated exclusively to and for postgraduate students during Terms, as well as one or two meetings per year exclusively designed for undergraduate students.
- Inductions, trainings and certain events should be mindful and respectful of PG and UG cultural and social differences. Ideally, sessions for/on Postgraduate students should be ran and delivered by Postgraduate students (i.e. by students representatives who are/were postgraduate students). Similarly, sessions for/on international students should be delivered by international students (i.e. by students representatives who are/were international students).
- The logo of the New Union should not resemble the current logos (e.g. bubble speech or shield) and a new brand identity should be designed.
Motion to Mandate the Graduate Union to urge the University to set up Scholarship Programmes to support Home BME postgraduate students.

Proposer: Alessandro Ceccarelli, President and Chair, Graduate Union (henceforth GU)

Seconder: Mrittunjoy Guha Majumdar, Chair of Exec and Vice-president, Graduate Union

The Graduate Union notes:

1. That Black students are one of four identified underrepresented groups at University of Cambridge (along with British Pakistanis, British Bangladeshis and people from white working class backgrounds).

2. That the average success rate of Cambridge admission for BAME applicants is concerningly lower than of white applicants (22% vs. 26.4%).

3. That the number of Black UK PG students has decreased since 2015-16, and that Black UK PG students represented only 1.29% of all UK PGs in 2017-18. These patterns of underrepresentation are concerning.

4. That the Cambridge Stormzy Scholarship is successfully attracting applications from Black undergraduate (UG) students. The Scholarship covers the full cost of tuition fees for four Black students (two in 2018 and two in 2019), and provide a maintenance grant for up to four years of any UG course.

5. The recent Postgraduate Mental Health Report, which includes results of a survey conducted with PG students by the Graduate Union (GU) shows that 27% of BAME PG respondents noted that racism has affected their mental health (including experiencing anxiety, depression, isolation, difficult supervisor relationships).

6. That some British universities have launched scholarships for Black and Minority Ethnic doctoral students. E.g. at UCL, the BME funding scheme, initially funded by the Vice Chancellor's Fund, it is hoped that donors will provide long term funding. Participants are provided with a programme of development activities, such as mentoring, in addition to generous funding. For more information on the scheme, see https://www.ucl.ac.uk/campaign/news/2018/nov/ucl-announces-brand-new-scholarship-programme-support-uk-bme-postgraduate-students

7. That some British universities has been accredited with the Race Equality Charter. As part of this accreditation, they examined their progression data and found that there was lower participation from BME students going from PGT to PGR. Thanks to Focus Groups, the lack of finance and lack of BME academic staff role models were found correlated to the lower participation from BME students. Positive actions were taken to address these factors which is permissible by law.
8. That BME dedicated funding and academic staff role models can be successful in supplying a pipeline of BME academic staff who will in turn encourage greater participation of BME Students. They would encourage other institutions to take positive action to address inequalities in participation.

9. That, in consultation with the Cambridge Colleges and wider University of Cambridge, the Student Support Initiative (SSI) was set up and it is currently running. This brings together a set of proposals to transform student support at Cambridge. In line with the *Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the Colleges on Postgraduate Student Numbers*, the Collegiate University via the SSI wishes to increase significantly the **number of postgraduate students who receive funding**.

10. That the Graduate Union has an existing campaign called ‘Campaign for Race Equality and Access through training and engagement’ (CREATE), being led by the Vice-President

**The Graduate Union believes:**

1. That the University should set up Scholarship Programmes to support Home BME postgraduate students, on the level of PGT (e.g. Masters) and PGR (eg. PhD).

2. That the University should look for internal financial resources as well as donors to set up long term funding schemes for Home BME postgraduate students.

3. That a portion of the current University of Cambridge SSI efforts and funding should be dedicated to increase the number of Black PG students and to offer them support before, during and after the application process.

**The Graduate Union resolves:**

1. To urge the wider University of Cambridge and Colleges to identify financial resources and donors, and to set up dedicated Scholarship Programmes to support Home UK BME postgraduate students, on the level of PGT (e.g. Masters) and PGR (eg. PhD). These scholarships should priorities students coming from a disadvantaged backgrounds and low-income families.

2. To urge the SSI to diverge efforts towards financial and welfare support for Black PG prospective applicants and new students, including possible mentoring post-application and more academic staff role models.
Transparent and accessible funding: a collaborative approach for a centralised system.

Proposer: Alessandro Ceccarelli, President, University of Cambridge Graduate Union  
Seconder: Siyang Wei, GU Open Portfolio Executive Officer, ‘PG Access and Funding’

The Graduate Union notes:

1. Cambridge colleges and departments have a significant amount of funding available, and they are seeking to raise significantly more, but the current uncoordinated and complex approach can make it hard to find and laborious to apply for in comparison with other Universities. This is reputationally damaging, both amongst applicants and their referees and funding bodies.

2. At the PG level, only a partial Government loan is available (less than 50% of the cost of a typical Masters course) and the limited University funding available is allocated on a merit basis rather than a needs basis - indeed there is no household income information available from the SLC or other sources on which to base an assessment of need.

3. For the University as a whole, 80% of the annual Masters intake is self-funding (data taken from CamSIS from student self-declared information in 2017/8).

4. The amount of self-declared self-funding for UK Masters students starting in 2017/8 was £14m and this does not include the funding gap for those students who could not meet the financial requirement.

5. Cambridge does not as yet have targeted funding available for Widening Participation at PG level, nor is financial need assessed in a systematic way.

6. The current lack of openness about funding availability and trust between the Collegiate University institutions have a negative impact on funding transparency and advertisement. This has been fostering an unwillingness to collaborate.

7. Access to funding is an incredibly important factor affecting their decision about where to study, and it is an area in which we want to improve, and which can help widen access to postgraduate study at Cambridge.

8. In 2019, the University has started the Postgraduate Funding Project. The collegiate university is working to (see https://help.uis.cam.ac.uk/projects/pg-funding):
   a. Reform the Funding Search tool, so as to enhance the Funding Search system and enter funding data during July and August, ready for the 2020/21 admissions cycle; and
   b. Create a unified application system for postgraduate funding so that applicants can apply for internal funding as part of their application for admission (this is currently limited to a few of the larger funders).
The Graduate Union believes:
1. That Colleges and Faculties have a duty to improve applicants’ experiences, and to attract and retain potential postgraduate students.
2. That transparency of information and processes should be guaranteed at all stages, so as to ensure fairness, equality and true widening participation and funding opportunities.
3. That collaboration across colleges, departments, and faculties should be agreed and sustained, so as to provide full funding packages for applicants.
4. That funding search tools and application process should be more efficient and more widely distributed, so as to be able to adapt to changes in the funding landscape over time.
5. That there should be improvements for providing students with efficient and effective processes and centralised systems, so as to improve the administrative experience and support them to take up available opportunities.
6. That colleges, departments, and faculties should collaborate with and actively support the Postgraduate Funding Project 2019, so as to promptly communicate their funding availability and advertise them via a centralised and easily accessible system.
7. Do we want to say anything about means-tested funding here?

The Graduate Union resolves:
1. To lobby for increased awareness of the existence of a centralised Funding Search Tool, see https://www.student-funding.cam.ac.uk/
2. To encourage governing bodies of colleges, senior and graduate tutors, and heads of departments and faculties to set up a transparent and active channel of communication with the Student Funding Search team and with the Postgraduate Funding Project so as to make their funding opportunities available and easily accessible for potential postgraduate students (e.g. Sally-Ann Gannon, postgraduatefundingproject@admin.cam.ac.uk).
3. To encourage Academic Rep and MCR/Students representatives to urge their colleges, faculties, and departments to collaborate and share their postgraduate funding availability so as to advertise them in a transparent and accessible way.
4. To support the Postgraduate Funding Project so as to improve the existing Funding Search Tool, to reform the application process and system, and to make the search for funding more accessible.
Motion to Support Fair & Equal Pay

Proposer: Stella Swain, CUSU-GU Welfare and Rights Officer

Seconder: Alessandro Ceccarelli, GU President

The Graduate Union notes:

1. The University and College Union (UCU) is conducting a ballot of its members on industrial action, which opens on Monday 9th September and closes on Wednesday 30th October;

2. The ballot relates to a claim jointly lodged by the five higher education trade unions (Unison, Unite, GMB, EIS and UCU) in March 2019 on the issues of pay, the gender pay gap, precarious contracts and workloads;

3. Staff across the UK HE sector have suffered a cumulative real terms pay cut of over 17% since 2009;

4. There are large and persistent gender pay gaps across UK universities, with disparities in excess of 15% across Russell Group institutions;

5. The gender pay gap in Cambridge is worse than the sector average: the mean hourly wage for women working for the University of Cambridge is 19.7% lower than for men (https://gender-pay-gap.service.gov.uk/Employer/cKLM2VVR/2018, March 2018);

6. A 2016 survey of UCU members found that academic staff work an average of 50.9 hours FTE per week;

7. Early career academics and postgraduate research students are often employed on hourly-paid contracts which limit their rights as workers and provide little security of employment;

8. UCU members engaged in industrial action over a dispute on the USS pension scheme during Lent Term 2018 with strong student support, including from CUSU and the GU;

9. Many GU members are also staff and UCU members;

10. There are ongoing links between the Graduate Union and UCU in the ‘Raise the Bar’ and anti-casualisation campaigns (http://www.ucu.cam.ac.uk/pledge-to-raise-the-bar/);

11. At the Michaelmas I 2018 Council, GU Council resolved to adopt a Memorandum of Understanding with CUSU and Cambridge UCU, which said:

   The unions’ interests are aligned: staff working conditions are the conditions in which students learn. They also represent the current and future working conditions of many students: postgraduate students in particular are often both staff and students. A university education is a collaborative relationship between staff and students and each benefits from the advancement of the other’s interest.
12. At the GU Council meeting in March 2019, a Policy on ‘Fair Pay and Support for Teaching and Research Opportunities’ was passed which resolved that:

*The Graduate Union adopts a policy to support fairness and welfare in research and teaching opportunities in the Collegiate University [...] All postgraduate and mature undergraduate students, in the Collegiate University, who have teaching and/or research responsibilities, should be adequately remunerated. This should include recognizing the time spent for preparation, marking, administrative work associated with their teaching* [See also: https://www.gradunion.cam.ac.uk/news/standing-up-for-our-university-staff]

13. The Graduate Union also passed policy to ‘support graduate students in their role as workers in collaboration with Cambridge UCU’ (May 2018), committing to:

*Work with the Cambridge UCU to uncover exploitative employment of graduate students and challenge the university to end bad practices where they exist.*

**The Graduate Union believes:**

1. Workers have a right to fair pay, pensions and fair treatment and should not be discriminated against because of gender, race, ability, or any other protected characteristic;

2. Many of the issues at stake in the dispute, including precarious contracts, disproportionately affect postgraduate research students who are GU members;

3. Students benefit from working with and being taught by staff who are fairly paid, have job security, and are not forced to take on an excessive workload;

4. Support for the 2018 UCU industrial action on pensions had a significant impact on both the success and impact of the strike, and the increased collaboration between CUSU, the GU and Cambridge UCU that followed it has benefitted all three unions;

5. The decline in staff pay and conditions is directly linked to the marketisation of higher education, as the current funding system dis-incentivises universities from adequately funding their staff, and should therefore be opposed where possible.

**The Graduate Union resolves:**

1. To lobby the university to provide fair pay, pensions and conditions to all of its employees;

2. To educate and inform its members about membership of UCU, the ballot, any subsequent industrial action, and the GU’s stance on these;

3. To support the ongoing ballot by sharing materials relating to UCU’s Get the Vote Out effort on GU social media, the GU bulletin, and in person;

4. To produce a statement of support for the dispute, to be shared with UCU;

5. To continue to engage with Cambridge UCU and other trade unions during the period of the ballot and potential future industrial action on this dispute, and to support those trade unions as the executive see fit;
6. To allocate budget where necessary to actions in support of the ballot and industrial action, including but not limited to flyers and posters providing information about the strike;

7. And, in the event that the ballot is successful and results in industrial action:
   a. To fully and publicly support staff and GU members in their upcoming strike action and action short of a strike, including but not limited to sharing and producing publicity, organising and funding picket line support and supporting actions UCU decide to take during the strike;
   b. To make provisions to mitigate the negative impact of disruption on GU members while not undermining industrial action;
   c. To provide information on the industrial action that is taking place to members of the GU, including details of how to support the industrial action, how we are supporting students during the strikes, and the work we are doing as the GU on this issue;
   d. To encourage students to show solidarity by where possible not attending lectures, seminars or other university-organised activity still in operation on strike days;

8. And, should the ballot not result in industrial action:
   a. To empower the GU Executive to continue to lobby the University to address the issues of pay, pensions, the gender pay gap, precarious contracts and workloads. This may include having consultation with UCU on further action short of a strike as well as raising awareness and sharing and producing resources;
   b. To continue to provide information about, and publicly promote, UCU membership for those who are eligible.
Motion on Training for Good Supervision

Proposer: Mrittunjoy Guha Majumdar, Chair of Executive Committee and Vice-President, University of Cambridge Graduate Union

Seconder: Alessandro Ceccarelli, President, University of Cambridge Graduate Union

The Graduate Union notes:

1. Since 2004, there has been an increased focus on UK universities to develop students as researchers, with research centres established in various universities as well as the publication of handbooks on postgraduate and undergraduate research;

2. In Universities UK’s report on *Higher education research in facts and figures 2018*, it highlights how research in UK is excelling: 76% of Research Excellence Framework 2014 submissions were ‘rated either world-leading or internationally excellent in quality’, the UK’s field-weighted citation impact was 1.57 (ranked first out of all G8 countries) and UK research accounted for 10.7% of citations and 15.2% of the world’s most highly cited articles;

3. The research community in the University of Cambridge comprises of over 1500 tenured academics, more than 3500 contract research staff and almost 4000 PhD students in over 70 academic faculties and departments and 140 University research centres and institutes;

4. Students are an important constituent in this landscape, in almost all the 12 strategic research initiatives and 7 strategic research networks;

5. There were 7092 applications made for the research degrees in 2017/18 cycle of the University itself;

6. There have been reported instances of bad supervision affecting the mental health of students. In the recently conducted Graduate Union Mental Health Report, 93% of students who reported that their supervisor has unreasonable expectations also reported mental health problems, while 25% of 1803 respondents report that their relationship with their supervisor has negatively affected their mental health. There have been cases reported to the Students’ Unions’ Advice Service (SUAS) that highlight the gravity of the problem;

7. In our discussions and consultations with students, issues have ranged from low frequency of meetings and research interactions, lack of clear expectations and boundaries in the project, lack of understanding and/or addressing disabilities (both visible and hidden), lack of advice on publications and career-related matters, and ‘feeling lost and unsupported’ during various phases of the research project;

8. In the instances when the student is not as active and close to their colleges as to their departments and faculties, the presence of welfare support in colleges and not enough welfare signposting know-how of the supervisors in departments could be detrimental to the wellbeing of the students.
The Graduate Union believes:

1. We believe that every research student must be supported in successfully completing their course of the student. As the entire education and research system for the student is intricately linked and reliant on supervision, we think this should be good;

2. While students need a good induction and training to take advantage of a supervisor, it is also pertinent that the supervisors are aware and actively working towards fulfilling these disparate needs of a student. They should be able to support in a timely manner before and throughout the project, and act as mentors;

3. Supervisors should be able to help with professional development, student learning and positive feedback, so that the research and course is meaningful to the student beyond the course itself, in their respective careers;

4. We also believe that there should be ways for the supervisees to feedback on the nature and kind of supervision provided, either by informal ways such as discussions with their graduate tutors and Directors of Studies, or more formal systems such as a centralized or department-based supervision feedback system;

5. Personal development within and beyond the project is crucial and therefore training modules and workshops must be attended by the student, and for this the supervisor should also encourage the student actively;

6. The awareness of when and how to intervene to either enact these suggestions or help the student a certain way is an important nuance of a supervisor’s duty. We believe that this can be better done with supervisor training.

7. The possibility of mandatory supervisor training must be seriously considered in the University for the academic welfare of students.

The Graduate Union resolves:

1. To lobby for a comprehensive training programme for all research supervisors in the University of Cambridge;

2. To work with the University and departments to promote supervision training in the Collegiate University;

3. To launch a campaign that shall look at student consultation on supervision and work towards regulated and possibly compulsory supervisor training in the University.

4. The Graduate Union shall run a signature campaign/petition among members for lobbying for mandatory training in the University for supervisors of research postgraduate students.
Motion to Lobby for Post-Study Work for International Students

Proposer: Mrittunjoy Guha Majumdar, Chair of Executive Committee and Vice-President
Seconder:

The Graduate Union notes:

1. On 12 September 2019, the Government of the United Kingdom passed a new ‘Graduate’ immigration route for post-study work visas, which will be open to all international students who have valid UK immigration status as a student and have successfully completed a course of study at undergraduate level or above, at an approved UK Higher Education Provider;
2. This post-study work visa will allow eligible students to work, or look for work, at any skill level or subject, giving them valuable work experience at the start of their careers;
3. Currently, graduates with bachelors or master’s degrees can look for work for only four months. The recent government policy is a return to the policy that was scrapped by the coalition government in 2012;
4. According to government sources, the new policy builds on government action to help recruit and retain the best and brightest global talent and opens opportunities for future breakthroughs in research and other world-leading work that international talent brings to the UK;
5. The new route will launch for the 2020/21 intake of students to universities in the United Kingdom. After the two years, they will be able to switch onto the skilled work visa if they find a job which meets the skill requirement of the route;
6. The current scheme does not include the current batch of students (2019/20 intake) in its purview and therefore deprives those students of opportunities for post-study work in the United Kingdom.

The Graduate Union believes:

1. The new post-study work visa stands by the principle of international cooperation and promotion of education for all;
2. The human resource that our members constitute is of immense importance and value, and must be supported and promoted as can be best done;
3. The post-study work visa must be fair in its remit and purview, with the inclusion of all students who are currently studying or shall study in the United Kingdom;
4. The government should have clarity and transparency about the purview and details of the new policy.

The Graduate Union resolves:

1. Stand up strongly for post-study work visas for all international students;
2. To campaign for the policy to apply for students in the 2019/20 intake;
3. To work proactively to inform our members of relevant details and changes to the existing policy on post-study work visas;
4. To work with the Careers Services to inform students about and facilitate the accessibility of opportunities for international students when it comes to post-work study.
Motion to Oppose University’s Neglect of Sexual Misconduct under Harassment for Cases before 1 October 2019 in University Policy and Procedures

Proposer: Mrittunjoy Guha Majumdar, Chair of Executive Committee and Vice-President

Seconder: Sara Hasan, Women’s Officer

GU Council notes:

1. From 1st October, following the passing of a Regent House ballot in June, the burden of proof required under the Student Disciplinary Procedures has been changed to the criminal to the civil standard of proof, also known as the ‘balance of probabilities’. The changes also see sexual misconduct explicitly defined as a breach of the rules of behaviour for students.

2. However, this new system will only work prospectively, meaning complaints to the University made by anyone who was, or is, sexually assaulted or harassed before 1st October will be assessed under the old procedures that rely on proof ‘beyond reasonable doubt’, even if complaints are filed after this date.

3. A recent change to the way the old procedures are interpreted, made by a Chair of the Discipline Committee on 20th June 2019, could mean students who file complaints relating to sexual misconduct that occurred, or occurs, prior to 1st October are unable to pursue a complaint against their attacker through University procedures, since the Chair decided the word ‘harassment’ within the University’s General Regulations for Discipline was being interpreted ‘too widely’.

4. The Chair apparently concluded that since the University’s ‘Code of Conduct for Students in Respect of Harassment and Sexual Misconduct’ distinguishes between ‘harassment’ and ‘sexual misconduct’, sexual misconduct allegations should not fall under the definition of harassment. The University defines harassment as:

   single or repeated incidents involving unwanted or unwarranted conduct towards another person which it is reasonable to think would have the effect of (i) violating that other’s dignity or (ii) creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating, or offensive environment for that other.

5. At least two formal complaints of sexual assault and rape have been dismissed earlier this year as a result in this change in interpretation.

6. A recent email by Prof. Graham Virgo, Pro-Vice Chancellor for Education, drew attention to systems designed to address sexual harassment or assault at Cambridge, including the University’s anonymous reporting system, Breaking the Silence, and the Sexual Assault and Harassment Advisor, Amy O’Leary. However, it was ambiguous in its addressing of how cases are investigated, with there having been cases that saw an initial ‘investigation by email’ with a University Advocate but no subsequent proper investigation.

The GU Council believes that

1. All cases of sexual misconduct in the University must be taken very seriously and fully investigated, beyond just correspondence and initial investigation.

2. Sexual misconduct and harassment leads to significant emotional and mental distress to the victim and any such cases against our members violate the University’s duty of care.
3. The change introduced by the change effectively deprives students of any internal recourse for sexual assault and misconduct, which is in breach of at least the university’s public sector equality duty, and therefore unlawful. For many students, taking external judicial recourse is tough and not plausible.

**The GU Council resolves to**

1. Stand up strongly against the change implemented by the Chair of the Discipline Committee.
2. Demand that the university take steps to fully investigate all reported cases of sexual misconduct at any time, working to support students in challenging the Chair’s interpretation.
3. To work proactively towards addressing and helping resolve cases of sexual misconduct in the University space.
The below is a proposed timetable for a referendum on the new students’ union. It is contingent of the calling of said referendum and subject to change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 2nd September →</td>
<td>GU Council Summer 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 14th October →</td>
<td>CUSU Council Mich 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation information</td>
<td>goes to Council: Elect the Elections Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 21st October →</td>
<td>GU Council Mich 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate responsibility</td>
<td>of Mich elections to the Elections Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 28th October →</td>
<td>CUSU Council Mich 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 28th October → Or</td>
<td>Announce Referendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 29th October →</td>
<td>Deadline to give GU council 14 clear days notice of the question to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be taken to referendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 30th October →</td>
<td>Email GU members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 5th November →</td>
<td>Campaign team deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 7th November →</td>
<td>CUSU College Forum Mich 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 11th November →</td>
<td>CUSU Council Mich 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 12th November →</td>
<td>Mich elections nominations close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign team deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 13th November</td>
<td>Candidates briefing from the EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign Team briefing from the EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 14th November →</td>
<td>GU General Meeting to discuss the matter raised in the Referendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 14th November →</td>
<td>Deadline for amending materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 15th November</td>
<td>Campaigning opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 18th November</td>
<td>Voting Opens in Referendum &amp; Mich elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaigning Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 21st November</td>
<td>Voting closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announce provisional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW-SU
the referendum
Introducing the University of Cambridge Students Union, or more informally known as, Cambridge SU.

Cambridge SU, a brand new students’ union, comes from a simple suggestion; what does better postgraduate representation look like? From this grew ideas and plans to not only improve postgraduate representation but the experience for all students at Cambridge University. It has taken a lot of time and work to get here, but we hope you’ll be as excited as we are we present what the future of student representation could, and hopefully will, look like.
We foresee New-SU as a groundbreaking organisation that leads the way in representation for all students, specifically postgraduates. New-SU will replace two current students’ unions, and be a single union for all students. In combining our expertise, we will ensure that all students, regardless of level of study, are represented, supported and have their voice heard across the University of Cambridge.

Further, we will continue to champion and elevate the voices of those with protected characteristics whose voices are not always heard across the university. No matter your level of study, background or the marginalization you may experience, New-SU will be a union that fights for you.
In our new structures we are further proposing two additional members of staff that will be focussing exclusively on welfare and activities; we know these are two areas that are really important to students. The creation of a new single students’ union will give us the opportunity to offer these provisions to you!
The Executive is a group of elected students that work alongside the eight elected sabbatical officers in ensuring the union work for and is relevant to Cambridge students.

They shall be responsible for:

- Campaigns that promote and protect the interests of the Members
- The implementation of Policy set by the Student Council
- The distribution of budget and funds to campaigns

There is a total of 22 representative on the Executive committee, in this new make up we have ensured that the representation of undergraduates and postgraduates is balanced. Where a campaign has two representatives on the Executive committee, one of these must be undergraduate and one postgraduate.
**SABBATICAL OFFICERS**

- President PG
- President UG
- Access & Academic Affairs Officer PG
- Access & Academic Affairs Officer UG
- BME Officer
- Disabled Students’ Officer
- Welfare & Community Officer
- Women’s Officer

**CAMPAIGN REPRESENTATIVES**

- BME Campaign
- Class Act Campaign x2
- Disabled Students’ Campaign
- Ethical Affairs Campaign x2
- International Students’ Campaign x2
- LGBT+ Campaign x2
- Women’s Campaign

**PORTFOLIO ROLES**

- Part-Time Students’ Officer
- Mature Students’ Officer
- Families Officer
structures
COUNCIL

8 Sabbatical Officers
11 Campaign Representatives
12 Schools Reps
62 College Reps
3 Exec Members
## SABBATICAL OFFICERS
- President PG
- President UG
- Access & Academic Affairs Officer PG
- Access & Academic Affairs Officer UG
- BME Officer
- Disabled Students’ Officer
- Welfare & Community Officer
- Women’s Officer

## CAMPAIGN REPRESENTATIVES
- BME Campaign
- Class Act Campaign x2
- Disabled Students’ Campaign
- Ethical Affairs Campaign x2
- International Students’ Campaign x2
- LGBT+ Campaign x2
- Women’s Campaign

## SCHOOLS REPS
- 12 Reps

## COLLEGE REPS
- 62 Reps

## 3 EXEC MEMBERS
- Part-Time Students’ Officer
- Mature Students’ Officer
- Families Officer
WHAT’S NEW?

- Closer links with Sabbatical Team
- Better staff and financial support
- Undergrad and Postgrad structural co-leadership
Academic Forum is run fortnightly throughout term time. It’s a space for Academic Reps to meet one another, to bring up issues that are of concern to the students they represent, to share best practice, and to discuss the wider issues surrounding education in Cambridge. Half of the meeting is currently given over to issues the reps themselves want to raise and then the other half centres around a discussion on a particular topic, such as Study Skills or Libraries. As Faculty Reps do not sit on CUSU Council, this is the primary contact they have with the Student Union and the forum is encouraged to write policy for Council to be proposed by the School Reps who do sit on Council.

College Forum is run fortnightly throughout term, hosted by a different college each time. It’s a space for JCR and MCR Presidents and Vice-Presidents/External Officers to come together to discuss issues that are of concern to the students of their colleges, share examples of best practice, and to discuss wider issues in the collegiate university.

WHAT’S NEW?

- Organised and scheduled with needs of both Undergrad and Postgrad students in mind
- Possibility for Undergrad and Postgrad specific forums