

University and College Union

Carlow Street, London NW1 7LH, Tel. 020 7756 2500, www.ucu.org.uk

To	Branch and local association secretaries
Topic	Interim report of the democracy commission: supplementary discussion document
Action	For discussion; to inform debate at Congress 2019 and ahead of the special Congress in November 2019
Summary	A discussion document (not for decision) which supplements the interim report of the democracy commission (UCU/934) which has been put to Congress 2019 for adoption
Contact	Catherine Wilkinson, Head of constitution and committees, cwilkinson@ucu.org.uk

Interim report of the democracy commission Supplementary discussion document

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The interim report of the democracy commission has been issued as circular UCU/934. Paragraph 2.2 states:

The commission may also produce a further collection of papers or proposals to be circulated to Congress as a discussion document (not for adoption or decision). Noting that many decisions of the commission have not been unanimous, the co-chairs have, over the course of the commission's work, invited any position papers, including minority positions from commission members, to be submitted for discussion and to be made available for wider feedback.

- 1.2 This is that discussion document. The papers contained in it, organised into three sections, are as follows:

Section 1: Papers discussed since the commission's interim report was issued, including actions where agreed

- **Electronic voting:**

Suggested position on electronic voting at conferences and Congress by Douglas Chalmers

Contribution to discussion on e-voting at Congress by Rachel Cohen

Action agreed by commission

- **Creating space for equality is a democratic act:**

Paper by Elane Heffernan

Action agreed by commission

Section 2: Minority position papers on issues discussed by the commission

- The right of recall by Sam Morecroft
- Proposal to introduce elections for the four national officials whose posts hold responsibility for organisation, recruitment and mobilisation by Elane Heffernan

Section 3: Papers that have not been fully discussed or represent areas where there is ongoing work to be progressed

- Recommendations for our democratic structure by Denis Nicole
- Proposal for strike committees to discuss key decisions in strikes by Elane Heffernan

1.3 These papers are presented for information and in the hope that they may stimulate further discussion and feedback from members and branches, which may include the consideration of motions to the November special Congress.

1.4 Papers are included in the form in which they were presented to the commission by individual commission members. Proposals within them, however described, are not proposals agreed by the commission. Action explicitly agreed by the commission in respect of papers in the first section of this document appears under the distinct heading 'action agreed by commission'.

Section 1: Papers discussed since the commission's interim report was issued, including actions where agreed

Electronic voting

Suggested position on electronic voting at conferences and Congress

Douglas Chalmers

The majority of delegates at the last Congress of UCU voted for electronic voting, although this wasn't passed since it needed a two thirds majority for a rule change. I would like to propose that the Democracy Commission also support the introduction of electronic voting at our conferences and congress, for the reasons stated below. I've put it in the form of a motion that individuals might support.

Electronic voting at Congress, FESC and HESC

Congress notes that:

1. Counting each card vote takes 5-10 minutes which means approximately an hour of time is lost each day of Congress, FESC and HESC that could be devoted to debate and policy making.
2. Electronic voting reduces opportunities for putting fellow delegates under peer pressure to vote a certain way, ensuring that the views expressed are more meaningful and reflect individual views.
3. The technology is available at reasonable cost to enable electronic voting and is widely used, including by the TUC.
4. A majority of delegates at Congress 2018 voted in favour of the introduction of electronic voting, but not the two-thirds majority required for a rule change.

Having considered the matter again, this Congress instructs that electronic voting be introduced at our subsequent Congress, FESC and HESC and thereafter.

Contribution to discussion on e-voting at Congress

Rachel Cohen

The advantages of card voting:

- 1) Transparency. We are delegates, not private citizens. Our votes should be transparent. It is usually very clear not just how many people have voted each way, but who it is who votes with you. This makes it easier for new delegates to meet and talk with people with whom they agree on topics.
- 2) Cost. It's cheap.
- 3) Simplicity. It won't 'go wrong' (except where manual counts fail). There are no risks with respect to the technology or to data retention.

The disadvantages of card voting:

- 4) Where counts are needed it's slow.
- 5) It relies on manual counts and these can be off, especially where votes are very close.
- 6) It provides no record (although as noted below, this may also be an advantage)

The advantages of e-voting:

- 7) Speed. e-voting would speed things up votes where counts are needed by 5-10 minutes. This affects a small minority of votes. Probably something between zero (in some FESCs) through to about 15 per Congress (from memory).
- 8) Transparency. It might be possible to retain records of who voted how. This could increase transparency across the union.

The risks of e-voting

- 1) Technological scepticism – if people don't see who is voting with/against a decision it makes that feel very abstract. Reduces the in-room transparency at Congress.
- 2) Mistakes. It is less easy to see what you are doing and may be difficult to correct a mistakenly pressed button.
- 3) GDPR non-compliance/exposing members to managers. We need to make decisions about keeping data and/or how widely any information is disseminated, when and to whom. Without these decisions being made in advance and consent being given there is risk of GDPR non-compliance.

Action agreed by the commission:

The commission discussed these papers at length at its meeting on 9 May.

Without pre-empting the outcome of motion 79 to May Congress, the democracy commission has commissioned a report to investigate what is possible with the technology available and what we want it to be used for. That means providing the following information in the form of a report to the November Congress:

- A) What are the costs of existing e-voting technologies?
- B) How easy are e-technologies to use, including how are mistakes reversed and how long does it usually take for people to vote?
- C) How are votes displayed in the room with existing e-voting technologies?
Typically, how long does this take?
- D) What data traces are left and how could these be managed without risk to GDPR – to ensure data security and address risk of hacking?
- E) How might we want to use the available data in ways that might increase transparency, including, to whom would it be made available/when would it be destroyed etc?
- F) Are there types of e-voting that make it visible how people in the room vote? If not, do we want to think about a mixed-mode (card and e-voting)?
- G) What are the implication for access and equality of electronic voting systems?

Creating space for equality is a democratic act

Elane Heffernan

1 Unequal society means some voices get more space than others even in union meetings

- 1.1 We live in a society in which babies are socialised very differently according to assigned gender and its supposed attributes, a world in which all sorts of racist assumptions shape the structure of our Colleges and Universities and one where some people—and their voices—are more equal, more respected and more listened to than others.
- 1.2 It is also a world of gender-based violence and the trauma that results from this can impact the ability of some of our members to function when voices are raised, they are interrupted when speaking or aggression is in the air. Thus, how we speak to each other as well as who speaks and when are equality issues.
- 1.3 Many members of our union have produced important research on these topics. But for this paper, I just want to point out that all this stuff—inequality by characteristics and class—has an impact on who speaks more and who expects to be listened to.
- 1.4 Trade Unions have historically been a space where a fight for equality has found some space (even if often in the face of some hostility at first as the Bristol Bus boycott showed) and burst out into struggles for change and equality. The Match girls and the New Unionism fought their way through the pale, male, stale craft unions to organise a new layer of workers, many migrants and women among them. Oppressed groups in the workforce have tended ever since to join unions in large numbers and to demand, as the Dagenham Women did, that their oppression in the workplace is broken. Unions have also been allies in the fight against oppression in wider society—playing a key role in the fight for abortion rights, marching for LGBT pride and against racism for example.
- 1.5 But the impact of oppression on individuals does not magically disappear when you join the union. A Hackney UCU delegate to Congress, at her first and only Congress so far, took the time in 2017, to count the visible or mentioned equality characteristics of everyone who spoke in Congress and FE Conference.
- 1.6 The results were telling—overwhelmingly white and non-migrant, overwhelmingly male, overwhelmingly not disabled, a clear majority older, while LGBT+ speakers were for the most part not visible

2 What does this have to do with the democracy commission?

- 2.1 Research shows that in any group setting men are more likely to feel confident to speak, more likely to speak more than once and more likely to speak for longer than women. *And other men are more likely to take note of what they say.* And this is just the most obvious effect of inequality in how the speaking time in meetings is used. All sorts of other subtle factors make our meetings far

too white and not fully inclusive of many people.

- 2.2 For democracy to function effectively in the union, we need to create in so far as we can, the best conditions for all members to raise questions, give their opinions, construct an argument for or against something etc. We rightly have a time limit on speeches at congress so that time is not dominated by a single voice. We also have rules about how we address each other and non-abusive behaviour, which are important in allowing everyone to be able to speak and the best chance for clarity of thinking without the stress that goes with aggressive behaviour affecting them.
- 2.3 As we can see from the counting of speeches at 2017 Congress & Conferences, we have work to do to have equality of participation.
- 2.4 The Chair plays an important role in trying to ensure that everyone has a chance to speak and that behaviour is not only respectful but also conducive to the best possible conditions for debate. However, this is an uphill task in many meetings as we often have a lot of business to get through and insufficient time for debate. But also, it is an issue because of how speeches are allocated at delegate meetings and NEC/HEC/FE etc. this has led to one occasion in my memory at Congress (2017) in which black women were queuing to speak but not a single one was heard in a debate on racism and during a Congress in which very few Black women had spoken.

3 PROPOSALS

- 3.1 We bring before the special Congress a proposal to ensure that there is the maximum parity of speakers in meetings at Congress and Conferences –this may need a rule change to be brought to special Congress for consideration.
- 3.2 We consider possible circumstances in which someone might be excluded from the rest of Congress/Conference for aggressive behaviour towards another person.

Action agreed by the commission

The commission discussed this paper on 9 May and agreed:

The democracy commission will bring before the special Congress a proposal to ensure that there is the maximum parity of speakers in meetings at Congress and Conferences – this may need a rule change to be brought to special Congress for consideration.

In respect of 3.2, the commission noted Congress standing order 34 which includes the power of the chair to exclude a member of Congress or sector conference for the remainder of the proceedings in the event of offensive language or inappropriate remarks: *In the event that any of these occur, the Chair shall immediately ask the participant to withdraw the remarks and apologise to the Conference and the individual(s) concerned. If the participant refuses to do this, or persists thereafter, the Chair shall exclude that individual (or individuals) from the rest of the Conference proceedings.*

Section 2: Minority position papers on issues discussed by the commission

The right to recall

Sam Morecroft

- 1** The majority of the Democracy Commission has agreed that the right of recall (that is, the right to remove an elected representative of our union) is an essential part of democratising our union. This means that all elected representatives of the union should be subject to a recall process; that if a majority of members want to trigger an early election for any position in the union they should be able to do that.
- 2** This is not a radical proposal. Every local branch officer and committee member is subject to a process of recall already, under the provision of rule 12 within UCU's Model Branch Rules (see below):

12 REMOVAL FROM OFFICE

Any member of the committee (including the officers and other persons elected to represent the Branch/LA) may be removed from office by resolution at a general meeting (including an extraordinary general meeting) of the Branch/LA provided that (a) the terms of any such proposed resolution are received by the secretary not later than the day that is [fourteen] days before the day of the general meeting and (b) the proposal for such a resolution is supported in writing by not less than twenty five members or 25% of the membership, whichever is less. Upon receipt of such a proposal the secretary will take all reasonable steps to ensure that that proposal is received by each member of the Branch/LA not later than the day that is [seven] days before the general meeting at which it is to be considered. Any general meeting which will have removed a member or members of the committee in accordance with the above will have power to replace any such member or members until such time as normal election of officers and other members of the committee next occurs.

The purpose of extending the principle of Recall to all elected representatives of the union is to ensure that all elected representatives of the union are subject to the same level of democratic control and accountability as our branch officers and committee members. These representatives act as the day-to-day leadership of the fundamental building blocks of our union; branches and local associations. The same level of accountability and member control that applies to our local elected representatives should apply to all elected representatives, at all levels of the union.

3 The Democracy Commission has designed proposals to allow for the Recall of a General Secretary, which Congress delegates will be able to vote on, and if carried these proposals provide a mechanism to recall a General Secretary and force an early election, in which the incumbent may stand as of right. However, this involves alterations to the contract of the General Secretary. Despite requests from the Democracy Commission to delay the General Secretary election, in order to allow Congress to vote on these proposals and implement them if carried successfully, a majority of the National Executive Committee voted to hold the election as soon as possible and in the shortest possible time frame. This means that a new General Secretary will have already been elected and be in post by Congress 2019. In an attempt to rectify this serious failing, the co-Chairs of the Democracy Commission have written to all three candidates for the post, asking for their views on the changes and if they support members right to Recall a General Secretary.

4 The Democracy Commission has also discussed proposals to allow for Recall of Officers, Trustees and Ordinary Members of the National Executive Committee (see below):

Rule Change Proposal for Recall of Officer, Trustee or Ordinary Member of the National Executive Committee

Add new rule no. 22.2; renumber all subsequent rules

20.2 – If 40% of constituent branches represented by an Officer, Trustee or ordinary member of the National Executive Committee (excluding the General Secretary) pass a motion including the phrase “This branch has no confidence in X and wishes them to be recalled”, a casual vacancy will be declared. Should this casual vacancy result in an election, the recalled officer, trustee or ordinary member of the National Executive Committee may stand as of right.

However, this proposal was voted down at the Democracy Commission meeting in March. While a majority of the Democracy Commission believe that all elected representatives of the union must be subject to a Recall process, as all local officers and committee members are, we were not able to agree on a suitable mechanism for how to do this. In the example above, one issue would be that it would require a far lower threshold of branches to recall an NEC member in a regional seat than for an NEC member in a national seat.

5 A particular difficulty was the lack of clarity around who ordinary members of the NEC represent, and therefore what membership constituency should have the power to recall them. For example, the North East region is represented by 3 NEC members. However, this region actually consists of two regional structures; Yorkshire and Humber region and Northern region. It would make sense that any process of recall would take place within a regional structure. But which regional structure should be able to exercise the right to recall? In this case, would it be necessary for both regional structures to vote to recall their representative? Equality groups also represent a challenge. For example, LGBT+

representatives on the NEC are elected by the membership as a whole – so theoretically would have to be recalled by the membership as a whole. This presents a problem however, as it would hardly seem legitimate for those members who are not LGBT+ to participate in a process of recall in regard to a representative of LGBT+ members. In short, the key challenge of designing a process of Recall for elected Officers, Trustees and Ordinary Members of the NEC is the lack of clarity on the constituency represented by these positions and who should determine whether an elected representative should be recalled.

- 6** The process of democratising our union does not begin and end with this Democracy Commission. It is an ongoing process. There is much talk in our union about the need to have an accountable, democratic and most importantly member-led union. For this to be the case, it is essential that the right to recall all elected representatives be enshrined across our union structures. If we want a union that is genuinely under the control of our members, we cannot allow a situation in which elected representatives remain in post when they no longer enjoy the support of those who have elected them, as bourgeois politicians, including our current Prime Minister, so often do. All elected representatives must understand that their mandate is dependent on the will of the members that have elected them and that their mandate ends when their support amongst members ends. In order to ensure that this is the case, this paper is intended as a plea to all members to take up the demand for the right of recall – that is, for members to recall and replace an elected representative – in every body of our union. This will be an ongoing political struggle in our union, but it is an essential struggle if we are to develop a truly member-led UCU.

Proposal to introduce elections for the four national officials whose posts hold responsibility for organisation, recruitment and mobilisation

Elane Heffernan

Unless otherwise agreed by the staff union UNITE, Nothing in this proposal is intended to alter the terms or conditions of current post holders (i.e unless the staff union agrees that elections for these posts may be introduced at the time of the next Gen Sec election or by a set date, then the provisions below could only come into effect as current post holders leave their posts)

Proposal is that

1. We bring before Congress 2019, for discussion, a suggestion that rule changes should be placed before the Special Congress of November 2019 to allow for the introduction of elections to the posts of National Heads of Service, where those posts have functions involving organizing, representing or negotiating on behalf of members. The affected posts being NH of Equality and Participation; NH of Democratic Services; NH of Policy & Campaigns; NH of Regional Organisation and Nations. The post of NH of Resources does not appear to exercise such functions.
2. Election shall be for a term of five years.
3. Candidates—we need to decide the scope of candidature. I would suggest either as per our GS rule (and rule wording below reflects that).
4. Should Congress 2019 agree the proposal we seek to negotiate with the staff union an appropriate date for the introduction of elections to these posts. If negotiations are unable to produce agreement on this matter we need to bring under rule 37.3, rule changes intended to come into effect (and election of the post holder) at a date specified in the motion as being “when the current post holder ceases in post”.
5. Because these are staff posts any suspension/disciplinary action could only come via NEC. I would suggest we looked to adopt a rule requiring 2/3rds of NEC members to institute any disciplinary action and a simple majority to issue an instruction in relation to exercise of duty

Reason for proposal

In order to increase the ability of members of the union to exercise democratic control over the functioning of the union.

Rule changes that I think would be necessary

- 1. Introduce new rule 29.1 (and renumber following) NB we must specify that as per rule 37.3 this rule change does not come into effect until such time as is determined by negotiation with staff, but not later than the next change of post holder**

29.1 There shall be four union employees who are designated National Head of Department and shall be elected from among union membership and union staff.

These posts relate to

1. National Head of Equality & Participation
2. National Head of Democratic Services
3. National Head of Policy and Campaign
4. National Head of Regional Organisation and Nations

- 2. Introduce New rule 29.2** addressing that NEC hold responsibility for accountability of these postholders and introducing the appropriate majority by which disciplinary action might begin or be suspended. **Suggest that we look to NEU rules for assistant GS as a guide, they have 2/3rds.**

- 3 Introduce a new schedule C (and rename current as D)**

To outline the process of election similar to current schedule B

Section 3: Papers that have not been fully discussed or represent areas where there is ongoing work to be progressed

Recommendations for our democratic structures

Denis A Nicole

1. The Democracy Commission was set up as a result of motions B19 and L9 at the 2018 Congress. The original version of this paper was submitted in good time for the Democracy Commission meeting on 8th March, but the Commission did not find time to discuss it.
2. In the contested ballots for membership of the commission, the turnout was typically around 7%. For two positions, there were no candidates at all. The Union clearly has a serious problem in attracting members to vote in internal elections. NEC elections have a better, but also poor, turnout; I was elected to NEC on votes by 17% of the electorate. The corresponding turnout in 2019 was 14%.
3. There are also serious problems with the democratic structure and the turnout at annual Congress and Sector Conferences. Large branches are systematically, and dramatically, under-represented. Through aggregation, each member of a small branch has a 1% "say" in the nomination of a delegate. Because of the current "1 per 400" rule (rule 17.2), however, individual members of large branches have only a quarter of this influence at Congress. The problem was particularly stark during Congress 2018, as much of the debate related to the pre-92 HE USS dispute. Pre-92 branches are typically large; thus those most concerned in the issue were disproportionately under-represented at Congress. Our GS came under severe criticism for her handling of the USS dispute from a Congress which under-represents those participating in it. Her position had, however, been supported by an electronic ballot of USS institutions: those actually taking part in the action.
4. It is also the case that the uptake of Congress places is rather low. For example, of the large branches that attended in 2018, twenty did not take up their full allocation. Furthermore, 33 HE and 56 FE branches who were entitled to send delegates did not come at all. Given this overall shortfall, it seems unlikely that branch delegates are being selected from a surfeit of competing applicants; it seems more likely that many branches are grateful to get anybody to go at all. A paper to the Commission from officials notes that, overall, the take-up of Branch places in 2018 was 66% in HE and 38% in FE.
5. In practice, at annual Congress and Conferences, the same delegates attend both Congress and their Sector Conference. Formally, however, and in practice at Special Sector Conferences, the Conference rules additionally favour very small branches: each branch is entitled to send at least one delegate to Conference, regardless of size. This particularly enhances the "voting weight" of

institutions that divide their UCU activity into several small branches. The rule has, perhaps, led some institutions to try to maximise their branch count. For example, there are currently four branches at the University of Brighton. Congress 2013 nevertheless debated (and remitted) motion 38: an attempt to overrule an NEC decision rejecting the creation of a fifth branch there.

6. I believe the Union needs to find ways to amend Congress and Conference entitlements to reflect more effectively the plurality of our membership. We also need to simplify, and possibly shorten and reschedule, Congress so that entitlements are fully taken up by delegates who are genuinely selected by their branches.
7. Special congresses and conferences have additional problems with the quorum. It only takes twenty branches to force a Special Congress or Special Sector Conference; the branches demanding the meeting are, however, unlikely to be entitled to send enough delegates to render it quorate. UCU has in the past wasted large sums of money on inquorate special meetings; this should not continue.
8. Finally, regional committees also have a strange membership structure. The delegate entitlement is "1 per 100 members or part thereof", resulting in very large entitlements for big branches; these are rarely fully taken up. Based on the 2016 Southern region figures, the total entitlement is sixty-five branch representatives from thirty-one branches. The quorum, however, requires just five institutions regardless of size; a quorum may be made up of just 8% of the delegate entitlement. A quorate regional meeting can thus be highly unrepresentative. Remarkably, some regions find even this low bar difficult. At the November 2018 NEC, we heard an appeal (NEC/1200) from Yorkshire and Humberside region to reduce the quorum further. Arrangements for the selection of "properly nominated representative(s)" of institutions (rule 4) are also in practice relaxed; at our last Southern Regional committee meeting, a senior branch officer arrived to find another member of the branch already participating in the meeting, unbeknownst to the branch executive. This is all particularly unfortunate as these unrepresentative regional committees are able to send motions and additional delegates to Congress and Conference. The last role seems unjustified; it just further skews Congress away from balanced representation.
9. The Democracy Commission was unable to find the time to discuss these ideas before the deadline for Congress motions. Southampton University UCU thus passed a rule change motion for Congress 2019 at its quorate General Meeting on 12th March. It has been ordered into Congress business as motion 78.

Proposal for strike committees to discuss key decisions in strikes

Elane Heffernan

Notes

1. The immediate issue causing a strong feeling of a democratic deficit in our union was the meeting on 28 March 2018 to discuss potential settlement of the USS dispute and the ballot and recommendations re voting in the ballot that followed this meeting.
2. Motions at Congress including motion 9 & 11 discuss the role of dispute committees, branch representatives in deciding on the conduct of disputes and ballots.
3. The FEC recently agreed a strike committee was a good idea to coordinate and discuss strike action across a number of branches.
4. We cannot begin a strike/action short of strike without a ballot and one suggestion to come out of the discussions at a workshop at the UCU Transformed event was that we should never end dispute involving strike/action short of strike without a ballot either.
5. There was also some dissatisfaction and dispute about who should attend negotiation sessions which would be useful to resolve.

Discussion

1. This paper is kept as short and simple as possible and the actual proposal is contained in a table at the end.
2. I think there is a need for a national strike committee for several reasons:
 - a. during a dispute there will be a need for coordination and liaison.
 - b. While ultimately all members will be balloted at start and end (if we decide this is a good idea at the DC) some of those voting will have broken the unity of the strike and crossed picket lines. There needs to be a mechanism for discussion in the branches before a plebiscite ballot so that those who have been actually on strike, organised picket lines, negotiated and researched the issues and progress of the dispute can discuss with members and come to democratic decisions about the branch position and then the delegates of branches can meet together to discuss the situation and recommendations etc.
 - c. In a national dispute, the strike committee is a bigger and more representative body than the current National Disputes Committee and

has the advantage of coming into being anew with each dispute, allowing for the changes that take place in branches during disputes.

- d. strikes need organising and coordinating and strikers need confidence, inspiration and solidarity. Strike committees would do this really well and in London during the USS disputes meetings organised by London region played this role, but informally and all sorts of informal networks spread the inspiring Leeds videos for example. I am proposing this is formalised.
3. This is a proposal for strike committees made up of branch reps at regional and national level to hold these two separate functions—
 - a. to assist the conduct of disputes by building and organising strikes on the one hand which would not need strict or weighted representation and
 - b. to provide on a national level a delegate body to decide upon such key decisions as: recommendations to pause a strike; whether to accept a proposal for resolution of the dispute agreed by the negotiation team; what recommendation should be put to the membership in a ballot. Such decisions do need weighted representation.
 4. In national disputes: Decision making regarding pausing, ending strikes, recommendations in ballots to pause strikes, accept settlement proposals (or demand amendments or outright reject) or otherwise to change the aims of a dispute should be made by a national strike committee. Information about proposals for ending should be scrutinised by this committee before HEC discuss.
 - a. Proposal: Strike committee should be one delegate per branch elected after a meeting and to represent the decisions of the meeting
 - b. Proposal: strike committee votes should be on the basis that the branch rep carries the weighting matching delegate entitlement at HE conference and FE conference
 - c. Proposal: skype or other electronic engagement in the meeting should be enabled to maximise participation, discussion and voting
 5. Negotiations lie with the national negotiators who are elected. There may be a need to have discussions during the democracy commission to ensure a minimum number of specifically elected negotiators are present at all discussions which may lead to proposals for settlement.
 6. There is a need for a rule change to bring the strike committees into being.

Issues for decision

If we decide to have strike committees:

a. Where does decision making lie? (currently & with suggestions)

Stage of dispute	current	proposal
Decision to Call a dispute?	HEC/FEC	HEC/FEC
Decisions about what kind of strike to propose —escalating? Top loaded? One day	HEC/FEC	HEC/FEC
Strike dates	HEC/FEC	HEC/FEC only after consultation with branches involved
Ballot wording	HEC/FEC	HEC/FEC
Prior to the strike/action commencing		National strike committee to be formed at this stage on the basis of 4 above
Local pre strike rallies		Regional committee/regional strike committee
Strike coordination meetings Can decide on rallies, demonstrations, hear Reports from negotiators coordinate collections etc		Regional strike committees
Proposal to pause dispute or to accept or reject settlement proposals And proposed wording of communication to all striking group members about this		National strike committee (NSC) —with weighted voting by size of branch makes binding recommendation to HEC/FEC Wording to be approved by NSC meeting
Decision on information to go with ballot & wording of ballot (ie whether the ballot is to accept or reject settlement proposals)		HEC/FEC but in line with decision of NSC (which has been via weighted branch votes)
Communications urging members to vote in ballot		Jointly from Chair of HEC & Chair of NSC in line with NSC decisions above

Proposal that we bring this paper to Congress 2019 for approval and bring subsequent rule changes to be brought to Special Congress Nov 2019.