UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK
ASSEMBLY
PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28 FEBRUARY 2024 VIA MS TEAMS

Present	Professor Stuart Croft	Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
	Dr Chris Twine	Secretary to Council (Secretary)
	Professor Maureen Freely	Chair of the Assembly Working Party, School of Creative Arts, Performance and Visual Cultures (Proposer of Motion 1)
	Dr Christine Achinger	Member of the Assembly Working Party, School of Modern Languages and Cultures (Seconder of Motion 1)
	Professor Naomi Eilan	Member of the Assembly Working Party, Philosophy
	Mark Hinton	Member of the Assembly Working Party, Community Engagement Development Manager, Lifelong Learning (Seconder of Motion 1)
	Professor Gabrielle Lynch	Member of the Assembly Working Party, Politics and International Studies (Seconder of Motion 1)
	Professor David Mond	Member of the Assembly Working Party, Emeritus Professor, Mathematics (Seconder of Motion 1)
	Professor Stephen Shapiro	Member of the Assembly Working Party, English and Comparative Literary Studies (Seconder of Motion 1)
	Professor Victor Tadros	Member of the Assembly Working Party, Law (Seconder of Motion 1)
	Sophie Black	Assistant Registrar (Governance) (Technology Assistant)
	Katharine Gray	Head of Governance Services (Minute-taker)
	Phil Griffiths	Administrative Officer (Governance) (Technology Assistant)
	Members of the Assembly (68 members present, inclusive of those above)	

Ref	Item
001	**Welcome and Introductory Remarks** The Chair welcomed members of the Assembly, declared the meeting open and reported that: • The membership of the Assembly included all staff employed on level 1-9 terms and conditions from the date of their employment. • The meeting was quorate. • The meeting was first announced on Insite on 14 February 2024. The Motion and associated documents were published online on the same date. The Secretary outlined the voting procedure, noting that an online poll would be used to vote on the Motion, with contingency measures in place should individuals encounter any issues. Verification of the vote count would take place after the Assembly meeting and the final outcome would be recorded in the minutes.
002	**Declarations of Interest** No conflicts of interest were declared.
003	**Chair's Business** There were no items of Chair's business.
004	**Minutes of the meeting of the Assembly held on 17 June 2022** **DECISION:** The minutes of the meeting of the Assembly held on 17 June 2022 (004-A280224) were **approved.**
005	**Matters arising from the meeting of the Assembly held on 17 June 2022** There were no matters arising.
006	**Standing Orders of the Assembly** The Secretary reported that:

	• The Assembly was not a decision-making body of the University. It could make recommendations to Council and Senate. • As the meeting was taking place on Microsoft Teams there were a number of the procedural elements under the current Standing Orders that did not apply. • That the Standing Orders were last approved by the Assembly on 15 December 2020.
	Items for Discussion
007	**Motion to the Assembly: Report of the Assembly Working Party on Antisemitism and Racism** Professor Maureen Freely, Professor Naomi Eilan, Professor Gabrielle Lynch and Professor Victor Tadros presented an overview of the Report of the Assembly Working Party, referenced in Motion 1: "*The Assembly resolves to endorse the report of the Assembly Working Party on Antisemitism and Racism*" (Paper 007-A280224) Key points raised were as follows: • The Assembly Working Party (AWP) was established in 2021 with a mandate to make recommendations on the handling of allegations of racism against staff or students and to consider recommending that the University adopt the Jerusalem Declaration on Antisemitism (JDA). • The AWP undertook extensive conversations with experts and stakeholders across the University community and the sector. Its findings focused on national and international debates around the JDA and International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definitions of antisemitism, the University's disciplinary processes; and the inclusion of consideration of antisemitism in new and emerging antiracism initiatives and policies at all levels of the University. • The recommendations set out in its report covered the use of definitions of antisemitism and approaches to improving understanding of antisemitism and relevant legislation including: the need for caution in applying definitions of antisemitism in University disciplinary processes; the need for legal considerations in University disciplinary processes relating to complaints of antisemitism; measures to ensure that Jewish students and staff did not experience discrimination; raising awareness of the implications of the Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act and recently revised disciplinary processes; the future oversight of ongoing work in this area. Comments and responses were invited, summarised as follows: • The work of the AWP was welcomed and its findings supported. • The recent outcome of the employment tribunal case that Professor David Miller brought against the University of Bristol was based on a complex application of the law and the outcome did not change the findings of the AWP report. • At a national level there was a focus on the use by Government and sector bodies of the IHRA definition of antisemitism but there would be a need to balance this with promotion of free speech. • Although the original brief of the AWP had focused on antisemitism, recommendations were not intended to be exceptionalist. The recommended lecture series on current and historical antisemitism could therefore be broadened to include other forms of racism. • Views which some may find offensive may be permissible under the Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act, provided that they fall within the law. • The recommendations set out in the report focused on developing a good understanding of antisemitism amongst those involved in education and disciplinary processes rather than relying on definitions. The report did not therefore recommend use of any specific definition. Although it could be helpful to consult definitions, consideration of context was essential in proscriptive processes.

A vote was then taken on Motion 1, with the results outlined in the table below:

	Vote Count		
	Electronic Vote	**Contingency Measure (vote submitted directly to Secretary to Council)**	**Total**
Motion 1			
Yes	40 (91%)	1 (100%)	41 (91%)
No	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Abstain	4 (9%)	0 (0%)	4 (9%)
		Total vote count =	45
		Members present at time of vote =	60

Meeting Closed 13:50