**Student Council 7th Week Trinity Term 2021**

**Tuesday 8th June 2021**

**Virtual – 5:30PM**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Agenda** | **Actions** |
|  | **Welcome and apologies**  Wesley Ding (Chair of Council) welcomes council members to the meeting and explains how Student Council will run, and some ground rules.  **Chair’s Announcements**  The Chair informs the Council of the following:   * When you speak, please introduce yourself by your name, college and pronouns if you are comfortable doing so * The meeting will be recorded | **To note** |
| **A** | **Minutes of the previous meeting**  Chair opened the floor to questions and comments regarding the minutes of the previous meeting and any matters arising from the minutes. | **To receive** |
| **B** | **Matters arising from the minutes**  There are no matter arising | **To receive** |
| **C** | **Elections in Council**  The Returning Officer (Caleb Van Ryneveld) explain the different roles up for election and the election processes, the details of which can be found [here](https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/21tt7w/).  **Chair of Council:** Chair of Council is elected in 7th Week Council each term to serve for the following term. They are responsible for the running, operation, and pre-planning of the meeting as well as sitting on Steering Committee. Council’s decisions have an impact across all levels of both the University and the Student Union, and as Chair you will be responsible for ensuring that this student decision making body is as effective as it can be.  **The first candidate is Asif Malik. Asif is not present, so the candidate statement of Asif is read by the Returning Officer. Full nomination can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/Asif-Khadim-Malik.docx)**.**  **The second candidate is Danqing Luo. Danqing is not present, so the candidate statement of Danqing Luo is read by the Returning Officer. Full nomination can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/Danqing-Luo.docx)**.**  **The third candidate is Jagyoseni Mandal. Jagyoseni is present and delivers the following statement:**  **Jagyoseni:** Hi, I am Jagyoseni, she/her pronouns, 1st year DPhil candidate at Christ Church. I want to contest for this role as I feel it is intrinsically related to welfare of the student body, and as already mentioned in the role description, the position allows you to have a direct impact on and ensure effectiveness of concerns that affect student and other governing bodies. I am one of the welfare officers of Christ Church GCR. I have also been the elected general secretary of the Oxford Indian Society and twice elected secretary of the Oxford History Society. So, I have been involved with various student societies in different capacities. I am also associated with Oxford Blue as Finance Director and Social Media Director of Uncomfortable Oxford, which brings me to the point that there are issues amongst students that are not always comfortable but need to be conveyed to the Union, as well as to the governing bodies, which I would of course like to do. There are a few issues I would like to bring up, one being that this pandemic has affected student experiences non-linearly. For example, a lot of students, including myself, had to go back to our home countries after Michaelmas term and then a lot of students weren’t able to return, so suspension is an issue that many students are facing, willingly or unwillingly. So, the way suspension is dealt with and how the pandemic has affected student experiences this academic year, especially for the students who will be staying on after this, to ensure it is not forgotten that it has been an exceptionally difficult year for the students who have been affected by the pandemic and that it is kept in mind until their course ends. These are the issues I think should be looked into and I would like to ensure they are addressed properly if I am elected. Thank you.  **Full nomination can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/Jagyoseni-Mandal.docx)**.**  **The Returning Officer opens the floor to questions for the third candidate for Chair of Council.**  There are none  **The fourth candidate is Marcin Pisanski. Marcin is presents and provides the following statement:**  **Marcin:** Hi everyone, I am Marcin, he/him, I am a law student at St Anne’s college. Before I move on to my manifesto, I think this is the last time I will be attending Council alongside the current Officers, so thank you all so much for adapting so well to the pandemic and congrats on the year and also congrats to the President-elect on your election and hope it is going to be a productive year for the SU. In terms of why I am running and what I feel I can bring to the role, I have had experience with the SU for almost 3 years now, I have been Student Council officer, I was one of the three student trustees elected last year, I was chair of the international students’ campaign and some other roles as well and outside of the SU I was a national society president, president of the legal society and some other roles. Now that I am not doing any of those in my incoming final year, I decided I could bring my focus and some of my skills learnt through them to serve the SU and I guess some of you might remember me from running in the Presidential election earlier this year. In terms of what I would like to do with the role, I feel the most important thing is focusing on representation and turnout and inclusion. So many JCR, MCR and campaign voting members don’t show up to council, which I think is the biggest problem in terms of representation, so I would try to prepare a newcomer's guide and to personally contact every single voting member once they get elected to the roles to make sure they understand how council works and how welcome they are to come here and to understand all the procedures, as it can be slightly confusing. I still remember coming to my first council meeting and almost leaving as I didn’t know what was happening, I didn’t know anyone and I don’t think that is an experience we should be prolonging for any other voting members who may be eligible to vote or to do so in future and welcoming non-voting students, who would benefit from knowing what the council is doing, which the current Chair has been doing and is excellent, but I feel there is still much to expand on and making sure everyone is contacted and knows what is happening. I spoke to some of the St Anne’s officers and they had no idea how council works and they would come if they knew more about it. I would be available for regular drop-in sessions with different voting members and do what the current SU President did when she was Chair, visiting different JCRs in person or virtually to make sure people feel connected to the SU and the Council and make sure they feel the Council is representative of their wishes. I would apply the current zero tolerance discrimination policy to make sure the Council is as inclusive as it can be in terms of welcoming students from all backgrounds. I think I have the experience, I have a lot of free time for the next year seeing as I will not be doing anything else, so I think I would be a good candidate and someone who would represent the SU and the students well and make sure Council runs efficiently in the way that it should run. Thank you.  **Full nomination can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/Marcin-Pisanski(1).docx)**.**  **The Returning Officer opens the floor to questions for the fourth candidate for Chair of Council.**  Wesley: I have a question with respect to Scrutiny committee. You said that you didn’t submit the reports because you were running for President, but I have been sending regular reminders to you, why has it taken for you until now to say why you weren't able to submit them?  Marcin: I didn’t see your messages, but basically I conducted the interviews at the last time I was impartial enough to do so, so after I was elected, slightly before or during Michaelmas and I had, as I am sure the Sabbs can confirm, over the break between Michaelmas and Hilary and at the beginning of Hilary I announced by candidacy for SU president and I was running again in the by-election, so I didn’t feel I was impartial enough to publish the reports that I had already conducted and interviewed all Sabbs or to conduct new ones and I am sorry if there was some miscommunication from me not replying to those emails, that was not intentional, I just didn’t feel I was impartial enough, I didn’t see any rules for resigning from that specific role, I know there is a procedure for resigning from other offices, but I assumed that is why we had two officers in the end and I did not feel that it would be in the best interest of the SU for me as someone who is a political candidate to be engaged in Scrutiny of current officers, as someone who might be succeeding them next year.  Wesley: thank you.  Nikita: do you think it is appropriate for you to hold the position given that you don’t feel you would be able to carry out its duties?  Marcin: sorry, what do you mean?  Nikita: you said you felt like you would not be seen as impartial if you did, for example, conduct Scrutiny interviews later on in the term. at that point, had you considered whether you were appropriate to hold that position given your unique circumstances back then?  Marcin: when I applied to be a Scrutiny Officer, I was not considering running for anything as that was a term before I ran for President, so I was not a political candidate of any kind at the time and by the time had conducted the interviews and was supposed to release them, I was already a candidate. Now I am not running for anything more besides this position and there will not be any other elections until this role term is over as it is just for Michaelmas, so there are no other issues of impartiality given I am not a political candidate any more.  Alex: you mentioned you have been involved with the SU in various capacities for years, so I was wondering what you think your biggest contribution to the organisation has been?  Marcin: The one I enjoyed the most and in which I met the most people I could help was as Co-Chair of International Student’s campaign. An important part of that was meeting with other Russell Group International Officers, so knowing there are other things going on outside of Oxford. Even though it was not successful in influencing national policy and I was not one of the lead people there, it was interesting to see Oxford students could influence national policy in some way and that International Students have a voice.  **Results for the election of Chair of Council**  Total valid vote= 26  Places=1  Quota=13    **Returning Officer:** The Returning Officer is responsible for all things to do with Elections and voting. In Council they look after the electronic voting pads. During Oxford SU's Leadership Elections they chair the Elections Committee, handle complaints and count the results!  This section of the meeting is chaired by Nikita Ma, SU President, as both the Returning Officer and the Chair of Council are running for this position.  **The first candidate is Cabel Van Ryneveld. Caleb is present and delivers the following statement:**  Caleb: I served as the RO since Michaelmas, overseeing the annual elections and campaign elections and presidential by election. I have also served on the Steering Committee and the Elections Committee where I helped to draft the rules for the annual elections. I have refined by commitment to detail and accuracy by serving as a member of the Bank of England citizen’s panel, Treasurer for an Oxford student society and grant panel member for charitable community organisation. With elections, I have a significant track record, 62% increase in turnout in annual election, credit to Elections Team, most voters for byelection. I have overseen election of over 60 candidates to the SU. Really committed to candidate welfare and making sure elections are accessible to all SU members. Candidate support initiative from this year well used during election process, work to further prioritize candidate welfare. High number of nominations in annual election, candidates from a range of backgrounds, vital for SU to reflect range of views of its members, commitment to continuing to support candidate outreach and making election process clear. Committed to continuing to oversee free and fair elections, ensure democratic processes allow all members to express their views, worked to support ongoing election functions in Council and promote effective management.  **Full nomination can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/Caleb-van-Ryneveld.docx)**.**  **The SU President opens the floor to questions for the first candidate for Returning Officer.**  There are none.  **The second candidate is Frantisek Jezek. Frantisek is present and delivers the following statement:**  Frantisek: I would like to thank the current RO for their excellent work, particularly the candidate initiatives, which I would like to continue, very important for increasing access and supporting candidates to run. I am a law student, law and bar society committee member, enjoy writing rules, by laws and rules of procedure, all part of RO role. Also been a member of an electoral commission of a national election in home country of Czech Republic, real world experience, second perspective. JCR officer at Corpus Christi, know running for positions is mentally taxing, important to continue and further initiatives, make sure candidates feel welcome, encouraged from all backgrounds. I have less SU experience, both other candidates excellent, issue of SU is some faces around for a while- value contribution, but important to have new faces, so SU remains reflective of student body, keeps evolving. Thank you all.  **Full nomination can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/Frantisek-Jezek(1).docx)**.**  **The SU President opens the floor to questions for the second candidate for Returning Officer.**  There are none.  **The third candidate is Wesley Ding. Wesley is present and delivers the following statement:**  Wesley: Chair of Council for past year, working to improve participation and engagement in Council, reaching out to low engagement groups, building communication with student newspapers to ensure coverage of what is done in Council, highest turnout numbers so far. Former member of elections committee. Comprehensive understanding of governing documents and election procedures. Want to ensure elections fair, transparent and most importantly, engaging for all students. Top priority is to improve turnout, make sure candidates feel supported throughout the process. Thanks to effort of current RO and elections team, record turnout this year, still less than a quarter of students, can keep aiming higher, work closely with JCR and MCR leaders to promote elections at collegiate level. Turnout higher at colleges that have candidates running, make sure candidates from broad range of colleges. Encourage more participation from PG students, underrepresented in student elections. Extend voting period, currently Tuesday morning to Thursday evening, not idea. Ran in SU elections myself, know difficult to balance campaigning with work, make sure candidates receive support from SU during election process. Initiative from UC Berkeley SU, voluntary wellbeing cap, invites candidates to commit to their wellbeing during elections.  **Full nomination can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/manifesto-Wesley.docx)**.**  **The SU President opens the floor to questions for the third candidate for Returning Officer.**  There are none.  **Results from the election for the Returning Officer**    **Steering Committee (x2):** Steering Committee is comprised of two elected student steering members, the Chair, the President, and the Returning Officer. Steering is the committee tasked with deciding the agenda for the coming Council. They meet the week before to discuss whether submissions should make it to the agenda, whether they need to be amended, or whether they require ‘steering’ to another committee first. Steering is also the group responsible for ensuring that an All-Student Consultation is held, if called for.  **The first candidate is Philipp Dietrich. Philipp is not present, so the candidate statement of Philipp Dietrich is read by the Returning Officer. Full nomination can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/Philipp-Dietrich.docx)**.**  **Results of the election for the position of Steering Committee member** | **To receive** |
| **D** | **Reports from and questions to Sabbatical Trustees**  Sabbatical Trustees supplemented their written reports available on the website with a short verbal update. Full reports from the Sabbatical Trustees can be found [here](https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/21tt7w/).  **Chair opens the floor for Questions and comments on officer reports**  There are none.  **Note: Sabbatical officers are maintaining blog pages on the Oxford SU website in the hope that this will be more accessible to students.**  The Open Event on the Race Equality Task Force for students will be taking place tomorrow at 4pm, and you can sign up to attend here! <https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=G96VzPWXk0-0uv5ouFLPkUuFfkELAbNMszyy7Ho672xUNVU4S0kwUVhOSjI5Rk9FSDY3QVozUzg2VC4u>  Here is also the link to our "it's not enough" campaign, and you can find out more and join the campaign here: <https://www.oxfordsu.org/itsnotenough/> | **To receive** |
| **E** | **Report from and questions to Campaign for Racial Awareness and Equality**  **Highlights of report from Harveen, Co-Chair of CRAE campaign:**  Harveen notes that campaign had set 3 targets last term from BAME Repcom- meeting reps, appoint people to unfilled positions and carry out a social by the end of term. The first two targets have been met, with Harveen’s current co-chair having to resign due to being elected as SU President, so the position will be advertised in the coming week and a by election. BAME social in 9th week hopefully, more socials next term. Standardise BAME rep position across colleges. Racial awareness training for Michaelmas for Fresher’s week. Picked up from what happened with ex-President elect. Got a good team together and here for people of colour at this University and improve their experiences.  **Full report can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/21tt7w/)**.**  **The Chair opens the floor to questions for the CRAE campaign**  Caleb: Having discussed the vacancy of co-chair position with Oxford SU staff, it has been said it should be filled if possible, with an appointment process, so there shouldn’t be a by election. | **To receive** |
| **F** | **Reports from and questions to Humanities UG and PG Divisional Representatives**  **Report from the Humanities UG Divisional Representative**  Not present.  **Full report can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/21tt7w/)**.**  **Report from the Humanities PG Divisional Representative**  Not present.  **Full report can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/21tt7w/)**.** | **To receive** |
| **G** | **Report from and questions Scrutiny Committee**  **Highlights of report by Eric Sheng:**  Eric notes he had difficulty in getting touch with all SU VPs and that another member of Scrutiny Committee had conducted some interviews, but Eric was unable to get in touch with them. Eric has interviewed the SU President and 4 of the VPs for the report. He notes they have done a good job, with a lot of their work being redirected to COVID response, meaning some of their work has been different to what was planned in their manifestos.  Note from Marcin Pisanski: I did conduct some interviews for Scrutiny, but I announced by candidacy for presidency before I could release them, so I didn’t feel I was able to release them for the report without appearing to be biased in any way. I couldn’t do it this term either as I ran again. I conducted some speeches with some other people who are not Sabbs and it appeared that some people might believe that that would be somewhat impartial. I conducted some interviews in Michaelmas, but the report will not be forthcoming for that specific reason  **Full report can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/21tt7w/)**.**  **The Chair opens the floor to questions for the Report from Scrutiny Committee**  There are none | **To receive** |
| **H** | **Report from and questions to the Trustee Board**  **Highlights of report from Nikita Ma, Chair of Trustee Board:**    Nikita covers what the Trustee Board is and its purpose and provides a short overview of the work of the Trustee Board across this year and the proposed agenda for the coming meeting of the Trustee Board in the upcoming transfer period.  **Full report can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/21tt7w/)**.** | **To receive** |
| **I** | **Budget and Accounts Report**  **Highlights of report from Wesley Ding, elected Student Trustee Board member:**  Wesley covers the key figures from the budget for 2021-22, noting that it has been drafted as in a normal year, which will be reviewed over the coming months.  **The Chair opens the floor to questions for the Budget and Accounts Report**  There are none  **Full report can be found** [**here**](https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/21tt7w/)**.** | **To receive** |
| **J** | **Items for resolution** | **To receive** |
|  | **Create a Welfare Officer Position for the Oxford SU Women’s Campaign**  **Council Notes**:   1. Women and non-binary students face specific challenges, and WomCam committee members may need support when working on projects of a sensitive nature or which may deal with triggering material. 2. Class Act has a Welfare Officer role.   **Council Believes**:   1. It would be beneficial for there to be a Welfare Officer on the Women’s Campaign in order to help women and non-binary students and committee members with welfare issues and generally promote the welfare of committee.   **Council Resolves**:   1. To amend the Oxford SU Women’s Campaign constitution to create a Welfare Officer post, as per Appendix B.   **Proposer**: Ellie Redpath, Magdalen College  **Seconder**: Issy Kenney-Herbert, Lady Margaret Hall  **Highlights of statement from Issy:**  Issy notes the benefits of this position and that Class Act already has such a position. Issy notes the issues facing women and marginalized genders that would benefit from a welfare position in the campaign. Issy further notes they are looking for the role to complete Peer Support Training.  **The Chair thanks the Proposer and opens for short, factual questions.**  There are none.  **The Chair opens for speeches on this motion.**  There are none.  **Results**  Votes 41  For 39  Against 0  Abstain 2 |  |
|  | **Educating Oxford Eating Disorder Training**  **Council Notes:**   1. Eating disorders are becoming increasingly prevalent in society, something which has been further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. 2. An Oxford SU survey in 2016 revealed that at least 5% of the student population suffered from an Eating Disorder. This is around 1200 students. 3. A recent Health England survey in 2019 showed that 16% of adults have signs of an Eating Disorder up from 6.7% in 2007. 4. Eating Disorders have the highest mortality of any mental health condition, with estimates as high as 10%. To put this into perspective, this is three times higher than the average mortality of COVID-19 over all age groups, which according to our world data is around 3%. 5. According to an Oxford SU survey in 2016, 58% of undergraduates and 53% of graduate students have experienced a mental health problem in the last year, with women being twice as likely as men to have experienced issues. The survey found that 51% of Postgraduate Research (PGR) students said that being at Oxford has had a negative effect on their mental health. Common mental health issues included anxiety, depression, and eating disorders. 6. Even before the COVID-19 pandemic hit, an Oxford academic in psychiatry said in 2019 that university mental health services were at a tipping point.   **Council Believes:**   1. Welfare officers should have specific training in Eating Disorders to help understand issues affecting these students, allowing them to direct them on to further support, and to have more understanding of them when speaking to a student with an Eating Disorder about the problems they face giving them more confidence in dealing with situation. 2. Freshers at Oxford University should be given Welfare training in freshers’ week on both mental health problems and eating disorders, to allow them to understand and recognize the signs of different mental health issues and in particular eating disorders, and to seek help early, as well as to be able to understand what fellow students may be going through.   **Council Resolves:**   1. To mandate the VP Women to lobby the colleges to allow time and space in their Freshers’ Week 2021 programme for Eating Disorder Training assisted by Educating Oxford.   **Proposer**: Isabel Creed, Exeter College  **Seconder**: Alex Foley, Oxford SU VP Women  **Highlights of statement from Isabel:**  Isabel notes that Eating Disorder training would be for freshers and welfare reps. The training would be run by them, plus some optional sessions with […] ambassador, national charity and with the psychiatrist from the counselling service. Isabel notes the great extent of mental health issues in the Oxford student body and the high mortality of those with eating disorders.  **The Chair thanks the Proposer and opens for short, factual questions.**  There are none.  **The Chair opens for speeches on this motion.**  There are none.  **Results**  Votes 38  For 36  Against 0  Abstain 2 |  |
| **3.** | **Oxford SU Policy on Student Mental Health**  **Council Notes**:   1. We are in the midst of a student mental health crisis:    1. A [NUS study](https://www.nus.org.uk/articles/over-half-of-students-mental-health-is-worse-than-before-the-pandemic) found 50% of students say their mental health is worse than before the pandemic. 29% of these students have sought support.    2. Since March 2020, Oxford University’s counselling service has experienced an average of 15% increased demand on 2019 levels. Demand for the University counselling service increased by 100% on 2019 levels during July and August 2020.    3. According to Oxford SU’s Wellbeing Consultation in June 2020, there has been a 29% increase in students struggling with “isolation/loneliness”, and a 23% increase in students concerned about the future. 2. The sabbatical officers this year have been working with the university on numerous wellbeing initiatives and committees, including the Mental Health Task Force. Throughout this work they have also consulted with student leaders, such as JCR/MCR Presidents and Welfare Reps, and student campaigns, such as the [Oxford SU Disabilities Campaign](https://www.oxfordsu.org/campaigns/disabilities) and [End the Eating Disorder Crisis Now](https://www.facebook.com/EndtheEDcrisis) who have been doing great work relevant to the area of student mental health. 3. This context has informed the principles outlined below.   **Council Believes:**   1. Every student studying at Oxford deserves to thrive. 2. Whilst we recognize that the University is not a healthcare provider, they still have a responsibility to their students to ensure that they are able to complete their academic work to the best of their ability. Doing all that they can to promote student wellbeing is a part of this. 3. The structure of an Oxford degree is intense, challenging, and often times stressful. Such a working environment can, at times, lead to the exacerbation of mental health difficulties, or contribute to a lack of mental wellbeing. The university should provide students, with the tools and services to deal with such an environment.   **Council Resolves:**   1. To insert the below as Oxford SU Policy for the next 3 years, supplementary to the [Welfare Vision (TT16; Updated and Renewed TT19)](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/your-union/governing-documents/Policy-Book-TT20.pdf).   **Student Mental Health Policy**  To mandate the sabbatical officers to lobby the collegiate university to:   * 1. Become compliant and sign up to the [University Mental Health Charter](https://www.studentminds.org.uk/uploads/3/7/8/4/3784584/191208_umhc_artwork.pdf) as soon as possible.   2. Create a Common Framework for Mental Health that is adopted across colleges.   3. Continue the expanded funding for the Counselling Service and plan for sustaining funding over the next 3-5 years.   4. Set up a new joint University and College committee on Student Mental health and Wellbeing.   5. Establish the role of PVC for Student Experience and Wellbeing.   6. Complete and publish a review of student wellbeing, and consider the fundamental changes that could be made to the Oxford student experience to promote good mental health and wellbeing, for example examining academic workload and term lengths, considering the addition of reading weeks, and investigating the diversification of teaching and assessment.   **Proposer**: Amelia Holt, Oxford SU VP Welfare and Equal Opportunities  **Seconder**: Alex Foley, Oxford SU VP Women  **Highlights of statement from Amelia:**  Amelia notes that this motion is an accumulation of work of the Sabbs with the Mental Health Taskforce across the year and with student groups, and want to ensure this work is solidified and able to be continued by the new Sabbs and to be implemented for the future.  **The Chair thanks the Proposer and opens for short, factual questions.**  There are none.  **The Chair opens for speeches on this motion.**  There are none.  **Results**  Votes 37  For 36  Against 0  Abstain 1 |  |
| **4.** | **Update the WomCam constitution to promote intersectionality and inclusivity**  **Council Notes:**   1. The Women’s Campaign has only recently been restarted, and thus it is important to ensure that the previous constitution from years ago is updated to reflect the campaign’s current values.   **Council Believes:**   1. It is crucial that first and foremost WomCam be an intersectional feminist campaign, and also use language which both ensures that the campaign tackles misogyny in all its forms and includes all students at Oxford who are women or identify in any way with the term ‘woman’. 2. All updates were made in consultation with the Campaign for Racial Awareness and Equality and the LGBTQ Campaign.   **Council Resolves:**   1. To make the changes to the WomCam constitution in accordance with Appendix B.   **Proposer**: Ellie Redpath, Magdalen College  **Seconder**: Issy Kenney-Herbert, Lady Margaret Hall  **Highlights of statement from Ellie:**  Ellie notes that this motion is part of a process of updating the whole WomCam constitution. Ellie notes the particular inclusion of intersectionality clauses and the inclusion of an asterisk to identify inclusion of all individuals identifying with any element of woman.  **The Chair thanks the Proposer and opens for short, factual questions.**  There are none.  **The Chair opens for speeches on this motion.**  Issy: WomCam has worked really hard on this, so please vote and support it.  **Results**  Votes 37  For 37  Against 0  Abstain 0 |  |
| **5.** | **The National Health Service (Policy Renewal)**  **Council Notes:**   1. This policy will expire unless renewed.   **Council Believes:**   1. This policy is crucial.   **Council Resolves:**   1. To renew the policy without amendment:   **The National Health Service**  Oxford SU Believes:   * 1. The NHS is a vital public service that the government should continue to ensure remains free at the point of use for all citizens and never introduces charges.   2. That Oxford SU should oppose the privatization of NHS services and the open marketing of front-line service ends, and oppose any moves to an insurance-based system of healthcare provision.   3. Oxford SU should work with local and national campaigns to oppose NHS charges that arise for international students.   4. Oxford SU should work with local and national campaigns to stand against and oppose cuts to the NHS.   5. That there should be prompt access to adequately funded and culturally competent mental health provisions, on campus and in the NHS.     **Proposer**: Michael Woods, Brasenose College  **Seconder**: Edward Peckston, Brasenose College  **The Chair provides a brief explanation on what policies are and the process of policy renewal.**  **Highlights of statement from Michael:**  Michael notes that both himself and the Seconder are open to any language changes in these motions and that it was a no-brainer to renew these.  **The Chair thanks the Proposer and opens for short, factual questions for motions 5-7.**  There are none.  **The Chair opens for speeches on motions 5-7.**  There are none.  **Results**  Votes 37  For 33  Against 1  Abstain 3 |  |
| **6.** | **Bin the Blood Ban (Policy Renewal)**  **Council Notes:**   1. This policy will expire unless renewed.   **Council Believes:**   1. This policy is crucial.   **Council Resolves:**   1. To renew the policy without amendment:   **Bin the Blood Ban**  That the blood ban on the groups (such as LGBTQ+ men and those who sleep with them) unfairly excludes them from donating; the government should continue with research, to repeal this ban in its entirety.    **Proposer**: Michael Woods, Brasenose College  **Seconder**: Edward Peckston, Brasenose College  **Results**  Votes 37  For 31  Against 1  Abstain 5 |  |
| **7.** | **Free Education (Policy Renewal)**  **Council Notes:**   1. This policy will expire unless renewed.   **Council Believes:**   1. This policy is crucial.   **Council Resolves:**   1. To renew the policy without amendment:   **Free Education**  Oxford SU resolves to support free education as a policy and work with the NUS and its campaigns to further this agenda on a national level. This includes providing, where reasonably practical, logistical support to student campaigners who wish to attend rallies and national demonstrations, led and/or supported by groups such as NUS.    **Proposer**: Michael Woods, Brasenose College  **Seconder**: Edward Peckston, Brasenose College  **Results**  Votes 37  For 32  Against 2  Abstain 3 |  |
| **8.** | **A better definition of transphobia**  **Council Notes**:   1. The definition of transphobia found in Appendix A will, in this motion, be referred to as “the proposed definition of transphobia”. 2. In this motion, the word ‘trans’ is inclusive of any and all non-cisgender identities. 3. According to the 2018 Trans Report written by the Oxford SU LGBTQ+ Campaign,    1. 98% of trans students at Oxford report mental health issues    2. A further 65% report that the University has had a negative impact on their mental health.    3. 63% of trans students have experienced discrimination from the University, with 97% of this being reported as transphobic discrimination.    4. 35% of respondents reported this transphobic discrimination as coming from staff and administrators of the University. 4. Anecdotally, the prevalence and severity of transphobia at the university has not improved, and has perhaps even worsened, since the Trans Report. 5. Claims of transphobia are frequently not reported or pursued, and are frequently written off when they are reported as simply being accidents or misinterpretations. 6. The proposed definition of transphobia was written by trans students in conjunction with LGBTQ+ Campaign, based on the Trans Actual and Lib Dem definitions of transphobia. 7. The proposed definition of transphobia has been endorsed by LGBTQ+ Campaign and WomCam [an email containing the proposed definition has been sent to the SU President’s email].   **Council Believes:**   1. It is important to have a specific, detailed definition of transphobia to be able to effectively combat it. 2. For a definition of transphobia to accurately represent the interests of trans people, it is important that it be written and/or approved by trans people. 3. Adopting a definition of transphobia written by and for trans students will show that the student body as a whole cares about trans students’ welfare.   **Council Resolves:**   1. To adopt the proposed definition in Appendix C as Oxford SU Policy. 2. To adopt the following as Oxford SU Policy:    1. To mandate the VP Women and VP Welfare and Equal Opportunities to lobby the university to formally adopt the proposed definition of transphobia for the duration of the policy.   **Proposer**: Zaman Keinath-Esmail, Corpus Christi College  **Seconder**: Elliot Brooke, St Hilda’s College  **Highlights of statement from Zaman:**  Zaman notes that the motion is to get the SU to adopt a particular definition of transphobia and lobbying the University to adopt it. The definition was written in collaboration with trans students and the LGBTQ campaign and endorsed by the LGBTQ campaign and WomCam. She notes the issue of the current definition being vague and reported transphobia being ignored and not addressed, preventing people to come forward to report transphobia. She notes defining transphobia as the first step in supporting students and addressing transphobia. The definition provides specific points, justification and explanation, addressing experiences of transgender students.  **The Chair thanks the Proposer and opens for short, factual questions.**  There are none.  **The Chair opens for speeches on this motion.**  Caleb: My principal concern is that as an educational establishment at forefront of contentious topics, important that views held by a significant proportion of the student body and medical legal professions alienated or blocked from expressed. There are parts of the motion everyone would agree with such as position against physical assault, abuse, harassment, ostracizing people based on trans identity. It concerns me that for example question of use of facilities is branded as transphobic, worth noting that UGov poll conducted by PinkNews, so by no means created for advocating for anti-trains activists, third people in UK uncomfortable with transgender individuals using toilet not aligned with birth sex and significant proportion of women uncomfortable if used a toilet with people with XY chromosomes, feel motion branding any such person who would uncomfortable about that as transphobic. Feel contrary to inclusive outlook of SU. Emphasis of transphobic to suggest any sort of delay when it comes to the administration of hormone therapy or sex changes, most people in UK agree person should receive doctor’s approval prior to changing legal gender, vast majority of people believe there should be some sort of process, not to make it more difficult for the person, but to help them understand what they are going through and the best way to go forward with that. Perhaps the proposers of the motion could clarify that. Understand that in some circles that this understanding of transphobia as opposition to delay would include advocating for current legal steps for someone to have sex change hormones or receive surgery. Important to not say we are not allowed to say discuss this issue, if someone targets a trans person, then that is appalling, but feel that is already covered by the SU and the University understanding of transphobia. With this motion, risk expanding scope of prohibitions on transphobia to include any form of discourse on the issue, which comes from the majority, some cases from the vocal minority, don’t think a woman is saying she feels uncomfortable being in that bathroom out of hate, personal decision, respect individual autonomy, extends both ways, open and accepting to trans individual, accommodative of fact that proportion of general population and University population will hold different views.  Issy Creed: thank you for bringing the motion, incredibly brave to talk about transphobia and the issues other people have faced sorry to hear experiences of transphobia in the University, feel any view or way that someone treats someone that makes other people feel that they aren't welcome, whether it is comments on bathrooms or opinions about somebody else’s life when they have the right to choose what they want to do is wrong and shouldn’t be accepted in the University. It shouldn’t be the case that going to the toilet if you are transgender is a difficult issue, basic right. Having a motion to make sure people are safe is important. If the definition is the appropriate definition felt by transgender students, from their experiences, then I would take their lived experiences into account and hope others would listen to them and their views on why this is an important definition of transphobia.  Elliot: Co-Chair LGBT+ campaign, trans rep for LGBTQ+ soc, trans student and seconder of the motion. This motion has been in the works for two terms, looked over by myself and Zaman who are both trans, campaign's trans rep, based largely on existing definitions of transphobia used in UK political parties. Felt this is a very reasonable definition that will massively help our ability to target transphobia which many people involved in writing this definition have been direct targets off in the University. The University is not doing enough to target transphobia, which is why in the trans report it can be seen that 93% trans students have had mental health issues, many caused by people at the University. I am absolutely willing to have conversations about the ways in which we ensure we are safeguarding women’s rights whilst ensuring trans people have access to the facilities that they need, happy to do outside of this meeting. Think we would agree that if a motion was brought about LGB rights, wouldn’t be speaking about leaving room for debate about their civil liberties and I feel like that is what is being said. Trans people are who they say they are, the definition explains why those points are there and how they can be viewed as transphobia. Urge you to read the definition in detail, understand why the points are there, happy to answer any questions, including on how come to those points are reasonable things to include. Don’t think suggesting that it doesn't leave room for debate about whether trans people should be entitled to basic safety measure like being able to use the toilet is appropriate.  Alex: So heartening to hear that Caleb is interested in women’ safety, as VP Women, holding Gender RepComs throughout the year, the issue of trans people using the bathroom has never once come up from students as to how women feel unsafe at this University, incredibly, disingenuous argument to make. We are not stopping the debate on violence against women in bathrooms, if someone decided to dress up as a woman and go into a bathroom, that is not a trans women attacking a woman, that is a cis man doing something ridiculous to a attack a woman. If we want discourse around it, let’s have it, but it is going to be framed correctly, about cis men and how they harm women in public spaces, I don’t think anything in this motion would stop us from having that discourse. Let’s make sure we are talking about the right thing and not just parroting disingenuous concerns from women who don't really seem to be present or extremely vocal on these issues in the gender rep coms or in the student body. Let's make sure we are talking real talk. Thanks.  Issy Kenny-Herbert: Think Alex spoke really well. Echo as Co-Chair of Women\*’s Campaign, we fully support this motion, many meetings on this, nothing in there that poses any threat to women’s safety. Very much like to talk to Caleb about any issues on women’s safety and if he would like to reach out to me, I would be very interested to hear his opinions on those matters, but I don’t think right now is the appropriate setting to voice this in what is not an ok way in my opinion.  Asif: I would like to admit to historically had trouble remembering the phrase, remembering my pronouns, I am 40, brand new to me, want to get used to it and do the right thing. At the same time, I feel people might be at risk of turning against people just because they have been labelled as a certain type of people. I did read that through the definition. I know there are some colleagues of mine, students, who do have opinions like Caleb and other people, in their opinions they do feel a certain way, don’t feel should stigmatise them, people do feel a certain way and hence, you should perhaps have a debate. Feel strongly about issue of recognition, bullying, why should there be washroom labelling issues, due recognition and space, not above anybody else, from that perspective, do support this. Do see that there are concerns. As oxford, done good work, need more externally, internal focus should be external as well, happy to have committee that recognises this and wish to do in college, would appreciate advice.  Nikita: As this motion has been written by trans students, if they think this is a better definition of transphobia, I am in full support of this motion.  Michael: Coming from the US, the bathroom issue historically through the US and civil rights struggles, fraught, not an argument one should be having here, think to give cover through freedom of speech through ignorant and irresponsible public discourse is not the expression of freedom of speech, irresponsible.  Caleb: I have no intention to step beyond my bounds and pretend to put words into the mouths of the Women\*’s Campaign or any other groups I am not a member of. Just conscious of the PinkNews poll that amongst 18-24 which is the demographic at Oxford, a quarter of people wouldn’t consider a person who identifies as a gender separate to that which they were born as, to be of that gender from a practical standpoint. Can’t comment on the accuracy but clear that a lot of young people, there will be a lot of students at the University who think this, figure for women is comparable. If they aren't represented in the elected membership of WomCam then unless PInknews intentionally overstating opposition to opinions they hold, which wouldn’t make sense, especially as using UGov, which is recognised amongst better polling agencies, reasonable accuracy, there are views such as those to do with bathrooms to do with status and full identity of people who identify as transgender, use of things like changing rooms, extent to which measures should be in place to consider process of transitioning, which are held by large number of people at the university. Can absolutely say that we as SU think views incorrect or that we are a majority believe that this is something we will oppose, but this motion is saying anyone who holds those views and expresses them is guilty of hate speech and transphobia. Saying 1 in 4 students at the University are transphobic, think disingenuous to use of term of transgender, devaluating term and criticism of people who act against minorities, fundamentally disingenuous, side-line large proportion of University population, make impossible to have discussions where there isn't actually consensus and where there are different views. If 1 in 4 women at the University feel uncomfortable, based on this U Gov poll, then that must be taken int account. Yes, there may be discomfort on the part of transgender people who would find they have to use a bathroom they don’t want to, but we must consider what is the appropriate balance for discomfort here, have two groups potentially distressed, think both matter and to suggest anyone who has any discourse on the issue is guilty of hate speech is something we definitely shouldn’t be endorsing and think completely contrary to the atmosphere of debate and discourse that we should be fostering at the University. Should be open to different ideas and if they are wrong, we should demonstrate why they are inaccurate, but it is not our place to shut down any formal discussion, to say that anyone who holds those views is a hateful person and must be condemned. Worth noting that the definition on transphobia suggests that if you are to be supportive of the statistically established reality that 80% of people who experience gender dysphoria as children will end up choosing to remain with their gender they had at birth, short of significant intervention, then you are guilty of transphobia. I think given that the statistics do show that in 80% of cases gender dysphoria ceases to be present for such people after puberty, I think it is really harmful to put in place restrictions on having discussions about this. Absolutely, as a Union, as a majority of the Union, we should these certain position on transgender issues, but this motion is saying that anyone who disagrees with that, a significant minority in this University and in some cases a broader majority in the rest of the country who disagree with that are hateful people guilty of hate speech when they express it and they must be silenced, shut down and prevented from being able to have discussion. I think that is the antithesis of any academic, personal or intellectual freedom and we should absolutely be standing against that.  Uri: There’s so much wrong with this. To suggest that the gender identity of people is up for general discussion, it’s not up for discussion, I cannot believe we are having this discussion right now. Honestly I hope that people here in this meeting are ok. It’s not up for discussion if a person says they identify as a woman, it’s not up for you to discuss and yes, to shut these discussions down is right as having these discussions is transphobic. I think this definition is right and trans people are in the best position to define transphobia.  Zaman: I think it is really important to make clear that we are not going to be walking around the University with a recording device in one hand and asking people what do you think about bathrooms and trying to catch people out or something, that is not the intention of this. The intention of this definition and what it will be used for is when a trans student feels that someone has been transphobic to them, and that happens more than some people might realise, that they can turn to the University or whoever else, and say this is what happened, this is transphobic, I would like to make a complaint and that that compliant will be actually listened to. At the beginning of the motion, there is a part that talks about people making mistakes, because mistakes do happen, I think everyone has at least once made a mistake with pronouns, myself included, but what is different is when, for example a college repeatedly calls out someone’s dead name and uses it in emails and so on. If it is done once and it is flagged up, that should be the last time, it should not be something that is persistent, that is one of the parts of the definition that we felt was really important. In terms of the questions of debate and voicing opinions, I think if these opinions and if this motion was about any identity other than trans identities, we would just not be having this conversation, we would accept that holding certain views about certain races, for example, is wrong and that it is racist and it doesn't matter how many people hold those views, it doesn’t change whether it is right or wrong. I would like to encourage you to move away from what do people think right now in this country, as honestly this country is not a good place for trans people right now and if there were no issue with how people thought and acted right now we would not be bringing this motion , this is to address a very real problem. So, I would like to remind everyone when we are discussing this that it is not just a question of numbers and percentages, but that this actually does affect people, real people at this University.  Harveen: I fully support what every single trans person in this room has said so far and it is so disappointing that no one is straight up calling this shit out. Being transphobic means you are a transphobic. If you are using the amount of transphobic tropes that have come up in the last 20 minutes, you are being transphobic. If one out of four students is doing things that are transphobic, turns out they are transphobes, it is not that hard to understand. This idea that we have to represent transphobes is extremely offensive as a student union. A student union is here to protect its students. If 50 years ago white people didn’t want to go to school with people of colour, would you want to represent those views as it turns out that is the kind of argument you are using. It makes no sense, I am so angry right now and I shouldn't have to be. I think that the people who put forward this motion, Zaman and Elliot, are having to be very polite and I don’t have to which is great. This is bullshit. Thanks.  Ellie: I don’t like how this is being framed as some kind of academic debate and how people are ignoring that this tangibly affects people’s lives. Not to rude, but I think it is incredibly disingenuous that Caleb keeps citing one UGov poll from one article and claiming that this must mean that a quarter of women at Oxford must think like this. I don’t think this a very genuine use of statistics and even if it were true, you are saying that a quarter of women at this University hold transphobic views and that is exactly what Zaman is pointing out by having talked about transphobia at Oxford before, so it still doesn’t really make sense as an argument. One UGov poll isn’t as important as what we are saying as chairs of WomCam and trans people on WomCam are saying in this meeting and consistently being ignored. Crucially, it is not more important than trans right and trans lives.  Aaron: I will echo what Harveen said about palatability, I don’t need to be palatable here, fuck this argument, it is ridiculous. It is not a fair argument, statistics are being wildly misused in a fallacy basically. It is saying that a poll of 18-24 year olds is going to represent the 18-24 years olds at this University. It was a poll of UK domicile people, which this University is not entirely compiled of, there are clear studies into differences of opinion based on educational level because of the discourses that are held and the way people are educated on what is and isn't transphobic. It is also basically just suggesting that any statistic can be transferred to any smaller group, which is completely wrong. Among that, I would like to say sorry to the trans people in the call or reading the minutes or watching the recording. I am so sorry that this is how this conversation went, this should not be happening at all. Like Harveen said, not that long ago there was a significant statistical portion of the population who thought that many of us here should not be in the same spaces as them, as ‘we spread diseases’ and that’s just false, in the same way that suggesting that trans women are attacking cis women in public bathrooms is false. People of colour do not spread disease, trans women are not attacking cis women, it is cis men. If you problem is with cis men, say that. It is incredibly disingenuous today that this a real concern and to only bring it up in discourse surrounding trans people, it is never brought up separately ever, I haven't seen it brought up once and we have been doing Student Council for a year this academic year, Caleb has been here the whole time. It is not fair to just bring it up now, it is incredibly disingenuous and again, I cannot apologise enough to the trans people in the call, I do not want you to feel that this is how the vast majority of the people in the call feel and the majority of us who present as cis or who are assumed to be cis or haven't explored their gender yet, please do not think this is how we all think because it isn’t.  Elliot: Thank you to everyone who has spoken out in support of myself and Zaman, this has been a very upsetting conversation to sit through. When this does go to vote, I would urge you to not think about this as a single issue motion, this is not just about who is using what bathroom, this is about protecting the mental health, the right to safety, the right to privacy, the right to comfort, of an incredibly vulnerable minority group within this University who are subject daily to institutional transphobia, that is what this motion is designed to prevent, that is what it has been put together to hopefully help stop so that trans students within this University can feel a lot more welcome than they have been made to feel today.  **The Chair notes that if anyone wishes to, they can seek support from the Oxford SU Advice centre at** [**advice@oxfordsu.ox.ac.uk**](mailto:advice@oxfordsu.ox.ac.uk)  **Results**  Votes 40  For 35  Against 1  Abstain 4 |  |
| **9.** | **Motion of Commendation: Vice-President Access & Academic Affairs**  **Notes:** I would first like to begin by noting that this has been an extraordinary year with the COVID pandemic. Tucker Drew has been taking upon himself responsibilities beyond the workload of a VP Access and Academic Affairs of a normal year just to improve the student experience and to make sure students are represented in all such conversations. Tucker has been working on many projects, including the Fair Outcomes for Students Campaign, on the Alternative Prospectus, as well as the Honour the Offer Campaign at the start of the year by lobbying for students in the committees he sits in. The highlight of Tucker’s work has been on the Fair Outcomes for Students Campaign, where the following outcomes were made possible because of his hard work, drive, and having spent endless hours in committee meetings simply to get the best outcome for the student body, - Students will not fail papers due to cohort-wide disruption - Students can ‘self-submit' mitigating circumstances without college or departmental approval - Students with coursework submissions can detail their disruption to exam boards. I believe all the work Tucker Drew has done this year is worthy of a motion of commendation, and I would like to thank the VP Access and Academic Affairs for all he has done for the student body in this challenging year.  **Council Resolves:**   1. To pass a motion of commendation for Tucker Drew, 2020-21 VP Access & Academic Affairs.   **Proposer**: Nikita Ma, Oxford SU President  **Highlights of statement from Nikita on motions 9-13**  Nikita motions of commendation for each of the VPs. Nikita notes this has been a difficult year with the pandemic and how hard the Sabbs have worked this year. She thanks them for their work, noting this work is in addition to normal Sabbs work load. She notes the Fair Outcomes for Students campaign, the sustainability strategy, accommodation work, mental health, sexual health, all alongside the COVID crisis. She notes that she hopes all 5 motions can be passed due to the extraordinary work of the Sabbs this year.  **The Chair thanks the Proposer and opens for short, factual questions on motions 9-13.**  There are none.  **The Chair opens for speeches on motions 9-13.**  Amelia: VP Welfare and Equal Opportunities. We also want to extend commendation to Nikit, she didn't tell us she was doing this and its very kind. We want to recognise that as a Sabbatical Team, the hard work she was done in this difficult year. Thank you Nikita and thank you for submitting such lovely words.  Alex: I feel like my commendation didn’t mention enough how hot and cool I am, but otherwise thank you, I appreciate it.  Asif: can we still raise motion of commendation or is that a formal process?  Wesley: it is a formal process, so sadly not. Thank you to you as well Nikita.  Caleb: I believe as per the rules of student council article 11.5, a motion of commendation may be brought to commend a student trustee in relation to their work and requires two thirds majority to pass. Can that be raised in the meeting or would that have to be raised as a standard policy style motion to Student Council?  Wesley: It does need to raised as a standard motion unfortunately.  **Results**  Votes 37  For 26  Against 6  Abstain 5 |  |
| **10.** | **Motion of Commendation: Vice-President Charities & Communities**  **Notes:** I would first like to begin by noting that this has been an extraordinary year with the COVID pandemic. Ben Farmer has been taking upon himself responsibilities beyond the workload of a VP Charities and Community of a normal year just to improve the student experience and to make sure students are represented in all such conversations. Ben has been working on many projects, including Planet Pledge, launching Park Run in Oxford, as well as lobbying for the final approval of the sustainability strategy. The highlight of Ben’s work has been on COVID crisis management. From reading and interpreting policies and guidelines by the Government as soon as they were announced, running workshops to help students and clubs and societies run events in a pandemic year, Ben has been at leading this project with his enthusiasm and reliability, which would be valuable to any organization. I believe all the work Ben Farmer has done this year is worthy of a motion of commendation, and I would like to thank the VP Charities and Community for all he has done for the student body in this challenging year.  **Council Resolves:**   1. To pass a motion of commendation for Ben Farmer, 2020-21 VP Charities and Communities.   **Proposer**: Nikita Ma, Oxford SU President  **Results**  Votes 36  For 33  Against 0  Abstain 3 |  |
| **11.** | **Motion of Commendation: Vice-President Graduates**  **Notes:** I would first like to begin by noting that this has been an extraordinary year with the COVID pandemic. Lauren Bolz has been taking upon herself responsibilities beyond the workload of a VP Graduates of a normal year just to improve the student experience and to make sure students are represented in all such conversations. Lauren has been working on many projects, including the in-between term card, representing Graduates in the Race Equality Task Force, as well as lobbying for the grace period for continuation fees. The highlight of Lauren’s work has been on lobbying for accommodation improvements for students. Successfully lobbying for the launch of the Accommodation Advisory Service and working with StudentPad to allow Colleges to list vacant rooms more easily are only two examples of the extensive work she has done in this area. None of this could’ve been accomplished without her dedication, perseverance, and having always kept the interest of students at the forefront of her work. I believe all the work Lauren Bolz has done this year is worthy of a motion of commendation, and I would like to thank the VP Graduates for all she has done for the student body in this challenging year.  **Council Resolves:**   1. To pass a motion of commendation for Lauren Bolz, 2020-21 VP Graduates.   **Proposer**: Nikita Ma, Oxford SU President  **Results**  Votes 35  For 26  Against 2  Abstain 7 |  |
| **12.** | **Motion of Commendation: Vice-President Welfare & Equal Opportunities**  **Notes:** I would first like to begin by noting that this has been an extraordinary year with the COVID pandemic. Amelia Holt has been taking upon herself responsibilities beyond the workload of a VP Welfare and Equal Opportunities of a normal year just to improve the student experience and to make sure students are represented in all such conversations. Amelia has been working on many projects, including extensive lobbying work in the Hilary Trinity Coordination Group with VP Women, lobbying colleges to take a harm reduction, welfare-focused approach for substance misuse, and supporting various student groups and societies by meeting with them and working on resources for them. The highlight of Amelia’s work has been her work on the Mental Health Task Force. The Task Force was created by extensive SU lobbying, and Amelia has also lobbied for the University’s agreement to commit to investing £400,000 in mental health, which includes expanding the Counselling Service and making it more inclusive, as well as providing additional counselling availability over Christmas closures. This is only one example of how Amelia’s devotion and empathy has translated into very impressive improvements for the current and future students of Oxford. I believe all the work Amelia Holt has done this year is worthy of a motion of commendation, and I would like to thank the VP Welfare and Equal Opportunities for all she has done for the student body in this challenging year.  **Council Resolves:**   1. To pass a motion of commendation for Amelia Holt, 2020-21 VP Welfare & Equal Opportunities.   **Proposer**: Nikita Ma, Oxford SU President  **Results**  Votes 36  For 32  Against 2  Abstain 2 |  |
| **13.** | **Motion of Commendation: Vice-President Women**  **Notes:** I would first like to begin by noting that this has been an extraordinary year with the COVID pandemic. Alex Foley has been taking upon themself responsibilities beyond the workload of a VP Women of a normal year just to improve the student experience and to make sure students are represented in all such conversations. Alex has been working on many projects, including extensive lobbying work in the Hilary Trinity Coordination Group with VP Welfare and Equal Opportunities, working with colleges and Common Rooms on rejections of dispensation to return to Oxford, as well as expressing student concerns whenever possible, even meeting with Michelle Donelan MP just to make sure voices of Oxford students reach the government. The highlight of Alex’s work has been the Sexual Health Education Survey they launched. By knowing what sexual health education students have received before coming to Oxford, welfare and support services can be improved to make these resources more useful to the student body. This is only the first step in their plan to make sexual education better at Oxford, such as creating a Sexual Education curriculum for students. Their passion and integrity in advocating for what is best for students has been truly remarkable. I believe all the work Alex Foley has done this year is worthy of a motion of commendation, and I would like to thank the VP Women for all they have done for the student body in this challenging year.  **Council Resolves:**   1. To pass a motion of commendation for Alex Foley, 2020-21 VP Women.   **Proposer**: Nikita Ma, Oxford SU President  **Results**  Votes 36  For 32  Against 3  Abstain 1 |  |
| **K** | **Items for discussion** | **To receive** |
| **1.** | **Representation review – Student Council**  **Notes:** Ben will provide an opportunity for students in Student Council to contribute their views on how Student Council can be made more effective.  **Proposer**: Ben Farmer, Oxford SU VP Charities and Communities  **Highlights of statement of Ben**  Ben notes that the slides shown in this presentation will be sent out following the meeting with the opportunities to submit additional thoughts and questions on the content following the conclusion of today’s Council, with all elements up for debate. Ben notes that the key areas for review with regard to representation are policy development, officer accountability and student council frequency, based on student feedback. Policy development covers the topics of ‘debate’ and ‘rubber stamp’. ‘Debate’ notes that Student Council currently does not have specific expertise on policy topics and expects members to have a broad expertise, which the ‘Rubber stamp’ section seeks to review. Complicated amendment process, debate in Common Rooms not being driven sufficiently, issue of having good policy. ‘Rubber Stamp’ will ensure more effective policy with review from more individuals. Student with policy idea, currently students can bring that idea, then would have a committee to take the idea, research and form it. Officer accountability- elected Sabbs performance review, currently scrutiny committee, issues with reports to Council currently, low questions presently. Alternative is Sabb feedback to the different committees. Concern of too many Student Councils, ensuring clearer policy, common rooms and campaigns have enough space to have the needed discussions on motions and policy. Committees support short and long term goals and review, ensuring more effective student involvement. All committees open to all students. Student council, twice a term. Bypass cycle through petition of 50 students.  **The Chair thanks the Proposer and opens for questions.**  There are none.  **The Chair opens for speeches on this item for discussion.**  Tucker: Still struggling to find words following the last motion. I think a good start to Student Council reform would be looking into the procedural motions we have, partially as I spent most of the last debate, looking to see if there were procedural motions that could be utilised to support trans students on the call and none of the 13 procedural motions unfortunately applied, so I think it would be worth investigating what procedural motions can be applied to the rules of Council and what students members in Council could do to ensure that the Chair of Council and other members of Council are using the powers that they have, one of which is to ensure good conduct in Council meetings and ensure students are not upset by discussions in Council. Thank you.  Caleb: I believe that as per the guidelines for student council, I am permitted to raise a point of order if I believe something has been said is defamatory and I do believe that suggesting that there was a problem with my conduct, as I believed was being expressed in the prior comment, is defamatory. Is there anything in my conduct in particular, I would ask the Chair, that violates any existing rules or regulations of Student Council?  Wesley: I do not believe that there are currently any rules for Student Council a to the content of speeches, to my understanding.  Caleb: thank you, so would you rule that statement out of order.  Wesley: I will announce that via email.  Tucker: I do not believe I suggested that but if the returning officer thinks so, they are welcome to gather the consent of two thirds of Student Council to expel me from the remainder of the meeting.  Caleb: that was not what the point of order was raised for, it was raised such that the Chair could consider whether to rule a defamatory statement out of order. That would have no bearing on the presence of the person who made the statement at the meeting.  Tucker: Ok, well I believe it is up to the discretion of the Chair then.  Wesley: I will need some time to look at that and I will get back after the meeting  Asif: the think the discussion for the new student council, the different societies, is really good. If all of the policies we want to get passed and the changes it would be good to have would be covered in the individual committees or whether there is a miscellaneous committee or an others committee as I am sure not everything would fit in that category.  Ben: Cheers for that, I will check that out, I think everything would fit, but if you do think of something, that you can’t think where it would fit, put it in an email, probably anything miscellaneous would be community, that’s my job at the moment. Work in progress, there would not be an absolutely fixed terms of reference, so it could be worked out where things would fit. For example, it might be an issue covering both UG and PG education like Inspera use, then that could be covered by both.  Tucker: I would like to thank the Returning Officer for drawing my attention to rules 1.3 of Student Council because I do see in the rules of Student Council. Actually, can I come back to this please? |  |
| **2.** | **SU Sabbatical Officers: Here’s 20 things we told the Uni to fix – A summary of our annual quality report to the Uni**  **Notes:** Every year Oxford SU's Sabbatical Officers take all the issues you've raised, plus the campaigns we've worked on over the year and submit them to the University in the form of an annual quality report which outlines 20 recommendations that the University should make. These are then sent on to the University's Education committee. Whilst the report contains a lot of suggested changes, we know it's not everything but it's a good place to start. We wanted to share this year's recommendations with you to get your thoughts.  **Proposer**: Ben Farmer, Oxford SU VP Charities and Communities  **Highlights of statement from Tucker**  VP Access and Academic Affairs. Tucker notes that every year the Sabbs bring a list of recommendations to the quality assurance committee and education committee along with the Proctors. Tucker notes that the recommendations have come from the experiences of the Officers and things the University is already moving forward on. He also notes that the Sabbs are happy to take any questions regarding the recommendations.  **The Chair thanks the Proposer and opens for questions.**  There are none.  **The Chair opens for speeches on this item for discussion.**  There are none. |  |
| **L** | **Any Other Business**  **Wesley, the Chair of Council thanks all present in the meeting and brings the meeting to a close at 19:46.** |  |
| **M** | **Appendices** |  |
|  | SU Sabbatical Officers: Here’s 20 things we think need fixing at the University of Oxford. Available [here](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/Annual-Quality-Report-2021-Student-Council(1).docx).  **Relevant for item K2** |  |
|  | Women\*’s Campaign Constitution. Available [here](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/Womens-Constitution-UPDATED.docx).  **Relevant for item J4** |  |
|  | A better definition of transphobia. Available [here](https://www.oxfordsu.org/pageassets/representation/student-council/21tt7w/A-Better-Definition-of-Transphobia-Appendix.docx).  **Relevant for item J8** |  |