

minutes & resolutions

meeting of: National Executive Council (nineteenth meeting)

place: Senate House, University of London

date and time: 26th September 2012, 11am

Members:

	Name
President & Chair	Liam Burns
Zones	Toni Pearce (Further Education) Paul Abernethy (Higher Education); James Haywood (Society & Citizenship); Vicki Baars (Union Development); Pete Mercer (Welfare);
Liberation	Aaron Kiely & Malia Bouattia (Black Students); Hannah Paterson & Daryl Jones (Disabled Students); Finn McGoldrick & Sky Yarlett (LGBT); Kelley Temple & Jo Johnson (Womens);
Sections	Daniel Stevens and Dennis Esch (International Students); Fee Wood (Mature & Part Time Students); Robin Burrett & Luke James (Postgraduate Students);
Nations	Stephanie Lloyd & Sam Reid (NUS Wales); Robin Parker & Stacey Devine (NUS Scotland); Adrienne Peltz & Claire Flanagan (NUS-USI);
Block	Alex Causton-Ronaldson, Michael Chessum, Caroline Dangerfield, Reni Eddo-Lodge, Roshni Joshi, Jake Kitchiner, Jamil Keating, Emma Meehan, Aidan Mersh,, Mark Seward, Matt Stanley, Joe Vinson, Mike Williamson, Jamie Woodcock
In attendance: Staff	Matt Hyde (Group Chief Executive), Jim Dickinson (Director Policy and Delivery); Vic Langer (Assistant Director Policy and Delivery); Simon Rayner (Director of Communications and Marketing); Graeme Wise Assistant Director (Policy); Dan Francis (Democratic Services Advisor)
Apologies:	Rachel Wenstone, Stacey Devine, Caroline Dangerfield, Danielle Grufferty, Claire Flanagan, Mike Williamson
Absent without apologies	Sean Rillo-Razcka, Surya Prakash Bhatta, Kyra Murison

minutes & resolutions

1. Introductory & Administration

- 1.1 Liam Burns (LB) opened the meeting and welcomed Paul Abernethy (PA)
- 1.2 Apologies were noted.
- 1.3 There were no declarations of interests.
- 1.4 The minutes of the NEC meeting 21st July were approved.
- 1.5 There were no matters arising.

2. Reports and accountability

- 2.1 LB presented his report to the NEC.

LB outlined that following the high court ruling on Friday 21st September NUS had welcomed UKBA's decision to allow London Met students to complete their course or continue to study up until the end of the academic year (2012/13). LB explained that NUS had filed a third party intervention in the London Met case and acted as independent experts. LB emphasised the importance of the intervention in the successful outcome of the case, but explained how the decision to do so had been both politically and financially significant. LB estimated the current cost of the intervention was around £30,000.

LB added that NUS was now turning pressure onto the Home Office to give certainty that students already enrolled are allowed to stay at London Met to finish their courses.

LB congratulated London Met Students' Union on its campaign and asked NEC formally to commend the work of Daniel Stevens (DS) in the area. NEC unanimously commended DS.

Alex Causton-Ronaldson (ACR) asked why NEC union allocations had been realised late. LB accepted that there had been a delay and apologised to the block. LB outlined that over the last few weeks his work had been focused on London Met and mobilising for the national demo. LB added that for the first time an email had been sent to all of NUS's membership outlining the NEC meeting and linking to the block allocation. LB explained that this type of communication would continue and expand in order to open NEC meetings up to the membership.

The report was *approved*

- 2.2 The Zone Convenors presented their reports, the following questions and issues were raised:

Union Development – Vicki Baars (VB) declared that she had received tickets to attend a honorary doctorate ceremony for Desmond Tutu.

Society and Citizenship – Danielle Grufferty (DG) sent apologies to the meeting.

Higher Education – Rachel Wenstone (RW) sent apologies to the meeting.

Welfare – Pete Mercer (PM) added that the accommodation cost survey had now received the highest response rate ever.

Further Education – Toni Pearce (TP) explained that, although the campaign had secured over £50m in concessions, the no to FE fees campaign was not over and that the next phase would be launched at Festival.

The reports were *approved*

- 2.3 The Liberation Officers presented their reports to note.

For the latest news follow @NUSNEC and visit www.nusconnect.org.uk/nusnec

minutes & resolutions

2.4 The Sections presented their reports.

2.5 The Nations presented their reports to note.

2.6 There were no reports or notices from Scrutiny or Special Groups.

LB asked for any final notes of interest in the ARAF committee to be sent ASAP.

2.7 There were no issues raised from block

3. Motions and Proposals

3.1 Nominations Committee Election

LB announced the reopened elections for nominations committee would be conducted by email over the next week. Liam encouraged members of the NEC to stand and vote in the election.

3.2 Comms Scrutiny Group

LB explained that in order to ensure joined up working but not to pre-empt any decisions made by the rules review process the Comms Scrutiny group would now take place at the same time as the NUSSL Comms group. LB asked for expressions of interest in joining the group.

3.3 Triennial Rules Review

LB introduced the paper from Democratic Procedures Committee (DPC), highlighting the letter he had sent to Steven Findley (DPC chair). LB drew attention to the lead officer for each of the thematic areas in the review. He reminded NEC that the rules review is ownership of DPC but that any review of NUSSL belongs to the limited companies' shareholders. LB also highlighted that Robin Parker (RP) had been appointed to run the review of London as he is politically removed and has experience of devolved administrations.

LB outlined three key questions for NEC to consider

1. Firstly, how would NEC like to be consulted on effectiveness of NEC?

NEC were invited to submit responses to the online membership survey. Michael Chessum (MC) argued that there should be an offline way to feed in by submitting papers for discussion. NEC discussed the importance of needing time to understand and think about the constitutional issues. LB agreed to discuss the rules review in more depth at the next NEC.

2. What issues do you think should be covered?

NEC discussed the thematic areas outlined in the paper and broadly agreed with DPCs approach. MC also outlined his particular interest in the size and role of block. LB agreed to circulate the former block member, Joe Oliver's, paper and let new block members feed in.

[Action – LB]

Aaron Kiely (AK) outlined his concern over the size of conference arguing that the smaller the conference the less representative of the membership.

NEC also discussed concern over motions which do not get discussed at conferred.

Luke James (LJ) argued that NUS has a year of action ahead and the rules review should not dominate the year. MC agrees but said he felt there was a real appetite for the review.

3. What information do you need?

Steph Johnson suggested pulling some of the membership survey results and brining these for discussion at the next NEC. *[Action – LB]*.

Vicki Baars (VB) outlined the importance of the process remaining open and suggested that a report should be produced on lessons from the review. Sky Yarlett (SY) requested that NEC ask DPC to share conference satisfaction data from DPC. *[Action – LB]*.

For the latest news follow @NUSNEC and visit www.nusconnect.org.uk/nusnec

minutes & resolutions

3.4 NUS Charity*

LB notified NEC that this paper would be brought to the next NEC.

3.5 Zones, Liberation, Sections Plans & Budgets

Mark Seward (MS) – raised concern over the KPI for the Individual Electoral Reform Campaign in the Soc & Cit zone. NEC agreed that the wording should change to 10 unions in key seats have election registration drives.

MC raised concern that a KPI, under the priority campaign, of 10,000 students attending the national demonstration was not ambitious enough, suggesting instead a number closer to the last national demonstration. NEC discussed the practicalities of raising the number and the importance of keeping numbers. SJ argued that the KPI should focus on the change in public opinion following the demonstration suggesting that impacts are more important than the number itself.

The NEC agreed to remove the number of participants as the KPI and instead asked LB to send a more suitable KPI around NEC which reflected the outcome of the demonstration [*Action – LB*]

The CEO report and operating plan from the last trustee board will be circulated for NEC to note. [*Action – LB*]

NEC Approved the Plans and Budgets, pending the adjustments discussed.

3.6 Detailed internal budgets*

NEC Noted the detailed internal budgets

3.7 Board KPI's*

NEC Noted the KPI's

3.8 National Demonstration Update

LB presented the paper and highlighted two key areas for debate; Individual legal advice and NUS's position on violence. Positions on both were important as students' unions had raised these questions over the summer and the Trustee Board had asked for clarity on the resources the NEC wished to make available, as this would have implications for financial planning. LB explained that NUS would take every step to mitigate against the risk of violent behaviour, both from police and protestors, however a clear stance on both was needed before the event itself.

LB proposed in the paper that NUS should not guarantee individual legal support as this would both set expectations that NUS potentially could not meet and expose NUS to unlimited financial risk. The paper also proposed that the public position of NUS on violence (in terms of vandalism of property, harm or intimidation) should be that it does not help our cause and we would not support such activity.

MC argued that there is a distinction between vandalism and violence to people. VB agreed but suggested LB take the line that both were unlawful activity.

Jamie Woodcock (JW) outlined his support that NUS was working with Defend the Right to Protest.

minutes & resolutions

RP suggested that NUS's messaging should centre around proportional responses and ensuring that behaviour by police which exasperated the situation was called out.

Robin Burrett (RB) argued that NUS shouldn't comment until all the facts were clear.

LB ensured that there was clarity over the questions being put in paper. The NEC voted and agreed. LB agreed to amend wording to make clear that whilst NUS would not support violent action, should such activity take place we should be clear on the proportionality of the incidents, both from protestors and police.

NEC approved on the paper

3.9 Initial Review of ODP*

NEC noted the paper Initial Review of ODP

3.10 NUS Brand Paper Approve

LB presented the brand positioning paper, highlighting recommended positioning. LB reiterated that the brand review was the product of extensive consultation with the membership and stakeholders.

Sam Reid (SR) expressed her dislike of the wording "Pragmatically provocative". ACR argued that the branding didn't seem to make NUS stand out from other third sector organisations. LB disagreed outlining the key messaging and the ambition sections of the paper. MC raised a concern around the use of the terms "fairer more prosperous society" although this did not receive much support.

LB would ensure such concerns were taken account of as the proposition was worked into copy.

NEC approved the Brand Proposition Paper

3.11 Paper on the Future of Education

LB presented the paper and invited Graeme Wise (GW) NUS Assistant Director (Policy) to answer questions.

JW asked how teachers and lecture unions would be consulted. GW outlined that this was the very start of the project and the trade unions would be consulted throughout the process, agreeing that there are areas we can build consensus.

RP agreed that having a vision for education was essential but that NUS also needed to think about how this would be translated in areas of devolved government. LB agreed but suggested that the overall vision should be the same.

SY argued that it is often difficult to engage some groups of students on this issue but that any vision should involve students from all background.

AP argued that in the present system inequality starts in the hospital bed and that the education system mirrors this. GW suggested that education should be about both making people effective and making sure people are liberated, NEC agreed that these concepts should be interlinked.

For the latest news follow @NUSNEC and visit www.nusconnect.org.uk/nusnec

minutes & resolutions

Jo Johnson (JJ) emphasised the need for flexibility in education and the need for breath and depth of subject area. NEC agreed that education should be more holistic and that student choice shouldn't force a very specialised education.

NEC asked how the vision for education would be both reflective of existing policy and given a mandate through national conference. LB explained NUS currently thinks within current structures and that whilst any vision should be reflective of policy we need to think outside of current frameworks. LB agreed that there would need to be policy to ensure that this work lives longer than one or two NEC's.

NEC broadly agreed with the concepts of the paper and the project.

3.6 Motions to NEC

Motion 1 We are London met

Proposing speech DS

Amendment1:

Speech for RB
Speech against Not taken

Reni Eddo-Lodge (REL) call for parts on amendment: remove NEC Resolves 6

Speech for REL
Speech against JW

Speech for ACR
Speech against Ak

Vote on parts: call for recorded vote

Keep	Jamil Keatin, Robin Burrett, Matt Stanley, Aaron Kiely, Malia Bouattia, Luke James, Michael Chessum, James Haywood, Jamie Woodcock, Daryl Jones, Vicki Baars
Remove	Finn McGoldrick, Hannah Paterson, Pete Mercer, Adrienne Peltz, Jo Johnson, Stephanie Lloyd, Toni Pearce, Sam Reid, Alex Causton-Ronaldson, Reni Eddo-Lodge, Fee Wood, Mark Seward, Joe Vinson, Emma Meehan, Aidan Mersh, Steph Johnson, Daniel Stevens, Robin Parker
Abstain	Sky Yarlett, Kelley Temple

Vote on Parts: Parts removed

Vote on amendment: Passes, parts removed

Vote on Motion: Motions as amendment passes parts removed

Motion 2: Let London met students study

Speech for AK
Speech against DS

Vote on Motion: Motions falls

Motion 3: No apologies for rape apologists

LB clarified the interrelationship between motions. Amendment 2: delete all and replace.

For the latest news follow @NUSNEC and visit www.nusconnect.org.uk/nusnec

minutes & resolutions

Speech for KT

Amendment 2: (taken first due to interrelationship)

Speech for: JW
Speech against: REL

Speech for: RB
Speech against: Finn McGoldrick (FMCG)

Point of information: VB

Speech for: JK
Speech against: SL

Vote on amendment: call for recorded vote

For: 3 Against: 25 Abstain: 2

For	Jamie Woodcock, Jamil Keatin, Robin Burrett,
Against	Finn McGoldrick, Hannah Paterson, Pete Mercer, Adrienne Peltz, Jo Johnson, Stephanie Lloyd, Toni Pearce, Sam Reid, Alex Causton-Ronaldson, Reni Eddo-Lodge, Fee Wood, Mark Seward, Joe Vinson, Emma Meehan, Aidan Mersh, Steph Johnson, Daniel Stevens, Robin Parker, Sky Yarlett, Kelley Temple, Luke James, Michael Chessum, James Haywood, Daryl Jones, Malia Bouattia
Abstain	Aaron Kiely, Matt Stanley

Vote on amendment: falls

Amednment 1:

Speech for: AK
Speech against: JJ

Speech for: Malia Bouattia (MB)

Point of information: JJ

Speech against: KT

Amendment 1

Vote on amendment: call for recorded cote

For: 3 Against: 27 Abstain: 0

For	Matt Stanley, Aaron Kiely, Malia Bouattia,
Against	Finn McGoldrick, Hannah Paterson, Pete Mercer, Adrienne Peltz, Jo Johnson, Stephanie Lloyd, Toni Pearce, Sam Reid, Alex Causton-Ronaldson, Reni Eddo-Lodge, Fee Wood, Mark Seward, Joe Vinson, Emma Meehan, Aidan Mersh, Steph Johnson, Daniel Stevens, Robin Parker, Sky Yarlett, Kelley Temple, Luke James, Michael Chessum, James Haywood, Jamie Woodcock, Daryl Jones, Jamil Keatin, Robin Burrett
Abstain	

Vote on amendment1: **falls**

For the latest news follow @NUSNEC and visit www.nusconnect.org.uk/nusnec

minutes & resolutions

Main motion:

Speech against: AK
Speech for: TP

Vote on motion: call for recored vote
For: 24 Against: 6 Abstain: 0

For	Finn McGoldrick, Hannah Paterson, Michael Chessum, James Haywood, Pete Mercer, Adrienne Peltz, Jo Johnson, Kelley Temple, Stephanie Lloyd, Toni Pearce, Sam Reid, Alex Causton-Ronaldson, Reni Eddo-Lodge, Fee Wood, Mark Seward, Joe Vinson, Emma Meehan, Aidan Mersh, Daryl Jones, Sky Yarlett, Steph Johnson, Daniel Stevens, Luke James, Robin Parker
Against	Jamie Woodcock, Jamil Keatin, Robin Burrett, Matt Stanley, Aaron Kiely, Malia Bouattia
Abstain	None

Vote on motion: Motion unamendemd passes

Motion 4: Liberty and legal observing

Speech for: MC

Amendment 1:

Speech for: HP
Speech against: MC

Vote on amendment: Passes

Speech against: Not taken

Vote on motion: Passes amended

minutes & resolutions

Resolutions

Trigger warning: This document contains a motion on rape

We Are London Met

NEC Believes:

1. The UK Border Agency (UKBA) has revoked London Metropolitan University's (LMU) "*Highly Trusted Status*." This will mean that non-EEA (international) students will have 60 days from receiving a letter of curtailment from UKBA to either enrol in a new institution or leave the country unless a legal challenge is successful.
2. UKBA claim that this is justified by "systemic failures" in LMUs ability to monitor attendance, language abilities and *Leave to Remain* status of its international students. Other than legal action, which LMU has initiated, the institution has no power to reverse the decision. Legislation does not allow for Government to reverse the decision unless forced to do so via Judicial Review.
3. NUS has secured a position on the Taskforce convened by David Willetts (Minister of State for Universities and Science) to support LMU students through the financial, academic and pastoral consequences of this decision, both for students who are forced to find a new institution and those students left behind.
4. International students are currently included in the Governments statistics on net migration, following UN convention that migrants are defined as any individual staying in a country not of their origin for more than a year and one day. Numerous reports have criticised this practice including the Higher Education Policy Institute, the Business, Innovation and Skills Select Committee and Public Accounts Committee.
5. Notes NUS Policy 207 "International FE" and 607 "Against Discriminatory Immigration," as well as LMU Students' Union belief that students should be allowed to continue at the university.
6. The threats to deport 2,600 students from LMU are the result of the government's racist immigration policies combining with processes of privatisation taking place both at LMU and across other universities.

NEC Further Believes:

1. International students must be allowed to continue their studies at LMU. Current legislation does not allow Government to reverse the decision themselves but NUS could act as an "*Intervener*" in LMUs Judicial Review and legally force the Government to allow students to continue at the institution, ensuring the student voice is fully represented in court and setting a precedent to stop UKBA making similar decisions at other institutions. The significance of this case justifies the high costs such an action would incur.
2. Should it become clear that the institution could have taken action to avoid this situation, NUS should support the students' union in holding LMU management to account. Our current focus however should be solely on securing the future of international students at London Met.
3. Should we be unsuccessful in allowing LMU students to remain at the university, we must campaign to mitigate against detrimental financial, academic and pastoral consequences, both through the Taskforce and in forcing Government and LMU to take responsibility for their failures.
4. NUS celebrates the positive impact of both international students studying in the UK and migration as a whole. The Government have claimed that they have reduced net migration by 30,000 in 2012 however international student visas fell by 75,000. International students should be taken out of net migration counts as they are not representative of migratory trends but are used as a tool to further the deeply flawed Conservative manifesto pledge to reduce net migration "*from hundreds of thousands to tens of thousands*"

For the latest news follow @NUSNEC and visit www.nusconnect.org.uk/nusnec

minutes & resolutions

5. That LMU students' union have led a fantastic campaign against UKBA's decision, securing significant press coverage and putting us in a far stronger position to reverse the decision.
6. . No migrants should face racist scapegoating or attacks, whether they are students or not.
7. 6. The early campaign has drawn in many students and staff from across London and the country, as illustrated by the solidarity campaign and the demonstrations.

NEC Resolves:

1. To endorse the decision to instruct legal advice on acting as an *Intervener* in the LMU Judicial Review. Should advice indicate that we would increase the chance of LMU students remaining at the university, we ask the Trustee Board to ensure resources are available to take such action. We will ensure our intervention is seen as distinct from that of LMU so we reserve the ability to hold LMU management to account.
2. To ensure students are allowed to continue their studies at LMU. We will encourage Students' Unions to lobby their MPs to sign the EDM tabled by Jeremy Corbyn MP, collect signatures for our HM Government e-petition entitled "*stop playing politics with international students*" and will use the LMU situation to mobilise international students around the country for #Demo2012, weaving the case of international students and London Met in our narrative on the Government's attacks on education.
3. To simultaneously ensure that, should our challenges to the decision not to allow LMU students to continue be unsuccessful, international students are supported in finding new institutions and home/EU students in continuing at the university academic, without being disadvantaged academically, financially or pastorally.
4. To work with trade unions, education sector bodies, colleges, universities, business, politicians and students' unions to restore the rights of international students in the UK, specifically in removing international students from net migration counts.
5. To commend LMU students' union and students' unions across the UK in their campaign to support LMU students.

No Apologies for Rape Apologists

NEC Believes:

1. That, as of August 2012, Julian Assange is wanted in Sweden to face allegations of rape and sexual assault
2. That a UK Court approved the extradition of Assange to Sweden to face allegations of rape and sexual assault
3. That Julian Assange is currently seeking asylum in the Ecuadorian embassy in London.
4. That in discussing the case, many prominent political voices have undermined and belittled rape victims, seeking to redefine rape on their own terms.
5. That George Galloway, Respect MP for Bradford West, referred to a man inserting his penis into a sleeping woman as, "bad sexual etiquette"
6. That the complaints in the Assange case are as follows: that on 14 August 2010 Assange committed "unlawful coercion" when he held plaintiff 1 down with his body weight in a sexual manner; that he "sexually molested" plaintiff 1 when he had condom-less sex with her after she insisted that he use one; that he had condom-less sex with plaintiff 2 on the morning of 17 August while she was asleep; and that he "deliberately molested" plaintiff 1 on 18 August 2010 by pressing his erect penis against her body.
7. That, in tandem with the Assange case, the right wing in the USA is debating the definition of "rape" in relation to anti-choice legislation.
8. That fewer than 6% of rape cases end in a conviction.
9. That 1 in 7 women students will be a victim of serious sexual or physical violence during their time as a student (Hidden Marks, 2010)

minutes & resolutions

10. That when women are rape victims in court, they are routinely interrogated by the defence about their sexual history, what they were wearing and how much they had had to drink when they were raped.
11. That 75% of rapes are committed by someone who is known to their victim.
12. That in rape and sexual assault cases where the victim is a woman student, the majority of the time the perpetrator is also a student (Hidden Marks, 2010).
13. That rape is an act of violence.
14. That penetrating someone as they sleep constitutes rape.

NEC Further believes:

1. That Respect leader Salma Yaqoob spoke out against Galloway, stating, "George Galloway's comments on what constitutes rape are deeply disappointing and wrong."
2. That political figures undermining rape victims and alleged rape victims is not exclusive to the Julian Assange case
3. That in 2011, Roger Helmer MEP attempted to distinguish between "classic stranger rape" and "date rape", stating "the victim surely shares a part of the responsibility, if only for establishing reasonable expectations in her boyfriend's mind"
4. That "Lad" culture on university campuses, lads mags and websites like Unilad consistently glorify, joke about or dismiss rape.
5. That rape is always the fault of the perpetrator and never the victim.

NEC Resolves:

1. To publicise the resource which the NUS Women's Campaign will develop on detailing what consent is, why it is essential, how to actively seek consent and how to teach others about consent.
2. That NEC councillors and NUS officers shall not share a platform with George Galloway, Roger Helmer or other speakers who are rape deniers, and who blame and undermine rape victims.
3. The NUS shall not offer a platform to speakers who are rape deniers, and blame and undermine rape victims, nor shall it officially support any event that does.

Motion to NEC: Liberty and legal observing

NEC Believes:

1. Current conference and NEC policy on the right to protest, which strongly condemns policing and sentencing at student and anti-austerity protests. It also condemns the fact that attempts "to demonise protesters in the media has created a false dichotomy between good and bad protesters."
2. That Liberty provided legal observers for the TUC national demonstration on March 26th 2011. This observing covered only the 5-hour period of the demonstration after 11am.
3. That Liberty's record on legal observing on the protest drew heavy criticism from the Network for Police Monitoring and other protest organisations for being too close to both the police and the TUC. Metropolitan Police spokespeople referred to repeatedly to Liberty's role in "working with us on the planning process."
4. Liberty's report of March 26th states that it believes that the police "acted proportionately"; it makes no mention of the Fortnum and Mason arrests, and makes no mention of the police attack on the student-organised occupation of Trafalgar Square. Liberty repeatedly made no mention of these incidents in the aftermath of the protest.
5. Liberty's report of March 26th, while not mentioning the most serious police violence, much of which was unprovoked, makes a number of references to 'violent protesters' and 'violent individuals' – often in the context of "infiltration" within the demonstration – and frequently fails to distinguish between property damage and physical violence.
6. Liberty is not primarily involved in legal observing. It describes its activities as "public campaigning, test case litigation, parliamentary lobbying, policy analysis and the provision of free advice and information." Other criticisms of Liberty's conduct on the March 26th

For the latest news follow @NUSNEC and visit www.nusconnect.org.uk/nusnec

minutes & resolutions

demo centred around logistical issues, and there being an inadequate number of legal observers in the streets.

NEC Further Believes

1. That legal observers exist to monitor the police, not protesters; they should not share information with the police.
2. That any mode of legal observation which failed to maintain this role, or which was seen to be partial, would be a danger to the safety of protesters and to the unity of our movement in the streets.
3. That legal observing of our national demonstration must not be time-limited: our members' safety does not cease being an issue after the final rally.
4. That Liberty's record in observing and reporting the TUC March 26th protest is a serious cause for concern, and raises doubts over their ability to observe our demo.
5. That numerous other organisations train legal observers: for instance, the Legal Defence and Monitoring Group, the Green and Black Cross, and the Network for Police Monitoring.
6. That the student movement should be building a level of self-sufficiency in terms of legal observing, and that activists and students should get legal observer training.
7. That we should be concerned about the issues stated here, and look into the many options for legal observation, while acknowledging that NEC voted to affiliate to Liberty last year, despite acknowledgement of the concerns over 26th March
8. That Liberty and NUS have worked in partnership in the past, including when Liberty offered a vast amount of legal knowledge on the right to protest guide, of which was consulted upon with DTRTP

NEC Resolves

1. To explore the many options for legal observing on November 21st
2. To continue to work in partnership with Liberty, Green & Black cross and others on right to protest work, but to approach legal observing following 26 March with due caution
3. Whatever the outcome of the above, to encourage students and officers to undergo legal observer training with the Legal Defence and Monitoring Group, the Green and Black Cross, and the Network for Police Monitoring. Appropriate resources will be made available for this