

Council Minutes

1st Week Trinity Term 2015

1st Week Council took place at 5:30pm, on Wednesday 29th April 2015, at Corpus Christi College Auditorium.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, please feel free to contact the Chair, Nick Cooper, at chair@ousu.ox.ac.uk.

- a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
- b. Matters Arising from the Minutes
- c. Ratifications in Council
- d. Elections in Council
- e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers
- f. Reports from the Executive Officers and the Divisional Board Representatives who wish to make reports
- g. Questions to members of the Executive and the Divisional Board Representatives
- h. Report from the Hilary Term Returning Officer
- i. Report from the OUSU President on NUS Conference 2015
- j. Emergency motions
- k. Passage of motions without discussion
- l. Motions of No Confidence or censure
- m. Motions to amend Bye-Laws, General Regulations or Election Regulations
 1. Bye-Laws Final Reading Motion
- n. Motions authorising expenditure
 2. Funding for 'Sex, Relationships and Disability: A day of workshops and training for staff and students'.
 3. Funding for Women's Garden Party
 4. E&E Divestment Campaign
- o. Other motions
 5. Motion to support On Your Doorstep's opposition to Oxford City Council's proposed Public Spaces Protection Order on rough sleeping
 6. Education Vision
 7. NUS Trans Full Time Officer (FTO)
- p. Any other business
 1. Quinquennial Review
 2. Trustee Board Report

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

No issues were raised with the minutes.

b. Matters Arising from the Minutes

No matters arising from the minutes

c. Ratifications in Council

None.

d. Elections in Council

Deputy Returning Officer – Benjamin Woolf (Christ Church) nominated.

No hust requested.

Benjamin – 53

RON – 4

SBV – 5

Benjamin Woolf was elected.

Steering Committee – Jakub Stawiski (Merton) nominated.

No hust requested.

Jakub – 58

RON – 1

SBV – 3

Jakub Stawiski was elected.

Undergraduate Position for JS(EC)SM (Joint Sub-Committee of the Education Committee with Student Members) – Jack Hampton (St Catherine's) nominated.

Hust requested.

Joe Smith (Somerville) – Explained that Jack was unable to attend and that he had requested that his speech was read out if a hust was requested:

“Dear Council,

I wish to run for this position for two reasons,

Firstly, I care about Unions- about the right to student representation, the right to express concerns and desires protected by the independence of our representatives. The relationship of the university to its unions is something I have fought directly to protect, when as president of Catz JCR I with the help of OUSU successfully maintained the

financial autonomy of our JCR against an illegal and illiberal college plan to centralise control.

Secondly, I want to be more involved in OUSU. I ran for JCR president because there were things at Catz and at oxford I wanted to see change. Many of these things coincide with the aims of OUSU particularly in the areas of Education and Assessment where I hope the education vision will be the start of serious reform. If I want to continue to fight for changes in these areas knowing better how OUSU works and how OUSU and the university interact to effect change is essential. This role would give me the opportunity to pursue each of these two ambitions.”

Jack – 58
RON – 3
SBV – 1

Jack Hampton was elected.

e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Stated that the main thing which he has been working on is the OUSU Articles, which is the second last thing on the agenda. Informed council that the articles are OUSU’s top layer of governance and very important, so encouraged them to have a read through.

Jack Matthews (University) – Updated council that the work on sabbatical remits has been presented to and discussed by exec, and will be coming to 3rd week council

Ruth Meredith (Brasenose) – Announced that St Hilda’s had become the 5th college to accredit to Living Wage. Informed council that she had run her last training session, and 80% of students felt that these sessions had made them a better trainer. Advertised a number of collections taking place over term, including a collection of bed linen for a women’s refuge and asked people to get in touch if they wanted to help out.

Anna Bradshaw (Wadham) – Informed council that she is preparing for the pilot of the OUSU Women’s’ Mentoring Scheme, continuing with the evaluation of consent workshops, and is in the middle of launching the Free Periods Scheme.

James Blythe (Brasenose) – Noted that there has been press coverage on changes being made to libraries and urged anyone affected by those changes to contact either himself or Jack, who both sit on the committee which will be responsible for agreeing those changes.

Chris Pike (St Edmund) – Informed council that the mental health charter has finally gone to the Senior Tutors Committee. Added that last term, he held an open evening for suspended status students, and is now building on that informal campaign and setting up working groups. Reported that he had attended the NUS LGBT Conference along with two other

delegates, which may have some relevance to motion 7, and that the conference as a whole was really good and very important.

f. Reports from the Executive Officers and Divisional Board Officers who wish to make reports

Joe Reason (Wadham) – Introduce himself as the OUSU Common Room Support Officer and explained that next Friday from 5:15 at the OUSU offices, there will be a meeting for OUSU reps and any interested students. Added that OUSU staff will be present.

g. Questions to members of the Executive and the Divisional Board Representatives

No questions.

h. Report from the Hilary Term Returning Officer

Joe Smith (Somerville) – Reminded council of the three upcoming referenda on sub fusc, gowns and mortarboards and the timing of statutory elections, as well as the Divisional Board Representatives elections which will be running at the same time. Announced that nominations are now open and voting will take place between Wednesday and Friday of 4th week. Explained that those who want to nominate as campaign leaders or divisional reps can find the forms on the OUSU website in the nominations pack, and will need to either send this to returningofficer@ousu.ox.ac.uk or drop it off at the OUSU office. Informed council that anyone can attend the election of campaign leaders, which will happen during briefing meetings, taking place at OUSU from 6pm of 2nd week. Asked anyone who would like to hold a husting in their college to come and see him after council or drop him an email asap.

Joe Smith (Somerville) – Briefly summarised the graduate bye-election, listing the turn out figures, stating that the MSL system worked very well and suggesting that the low turn out highlights that OUSU need to work on their engagement with graduate students.

i. Report from the OUSU President on NUS Conference 2015

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Reported that NUS Conference was both very frustrating and also very encouraging in varying ways and that the report suggests ways in which OUSU can engage better with conference. Suggested that we think about conference with a long-term approach, looking at our own motions that have a national context, and adding a resolves to take them to NUS. Highlighted that the report covers the counter-terrorism motion and the trans officer motion, and clarifies how the trustees voted.

Barnaby Raine (Wadham) – Informed council that it was disheartening to go to NUS Conference for the first time, after hearing all the rhetoric in favour of the autonomy liberation, to see the trans officer motion voted down. Added that this was emotional and unpleasant and stated that he hoped that in Oxford, we will continue to fight for this motion.

Chris Casson (St Catherine's) – Asked the delegates what the arguments were against having a trans officer.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) – Reported that the NUS leadership co-opted the language of liberation and spoke about the autonomy of the LGBT Campaign. Explained that the trans conference had previously voted unanimously for a trans officer, yet because it had a majority at GBT Conference, but didn't reach two thirds, it was said that voting for the motion would be going against the autonomy of the LGBT Campaign. Argued that this claim was disingenuous.

a. Emergency motions

None

k. Passage of motions without discussion

No motions passed without discussion.

l. Motions of No Confidence or censure

No motions of no confidence or censure.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) – Requested to move motion 7 to the top of the agenda.

No objection.

7. NUS Trans Full Time Officer (FTO)

Council Notes:

1. Every national and local caucus of trans students for the last two years has been almost unanimous in supporting an NUS FTO
2. This year the motion reached a majority but not 2/3 at NUS LGBT conference
3. The same happened at NUS National Conference

Council Believes:

1. The actions of many cis delegates around this, blocking trans people from having a voice, should be condemned
2. It is up to trans students to decide what our liberation looks like not majority cis delegations

Council Resolves:

1. To bind future NUS delegates to vote in favour of a full time trans officer
2. To make Council Believes 1 and 2 and Council Resolves 1 OUSU Council Policy.

Proposed: Rowan Davis (Wadham)

Seconded: Henry Holmes (Wadham)

Amendment Received:

Change Council Resolves 2 to:

2. To advocate for the Trans Full Time Officer motion to be as high on the agenda as embodied in the spirit of OUSU Council.

And add to Council Resolves:

3. To make Council Believes 1 and 2 and Council Resolves 1 and 2 OUSU Council Policy.

Proposed: Rowan Davis (Wadham)

Seconded: Henry Holmes (Wadham)

Rowan Davis – Informed council that she fully supports the trans full time officer motion. Stated that at NUS Conference this year, the outcome of this motion was an affront to trans politics, as at every single trans caucus, people have been unanimously in support of this position. Explained that a full time trans officer will provide trans students with a voice to fight on national issues, something which is very difficult as they are a very dispersed group. Added that the amendment to the motion is intended to push this motion to the top of agendas, as there are students who will try and push it down. Informed council that she had a referendum of Oxford trans students who all voted unanimously on this and urged council to respect trans autonomy by voting for the motion.

St Benet's student – Asked what the role and responsibilities of this position would be.

Rowan – Replied that a trans officer in a full time role would be able to lobby for national issues, such as the changing of passports and better healthcare reform and would provide trans students with a voice.

Chris Pike (St Edmund) – Informed council that at NUS Conference, the vote on this motion went to a secret ballot, so asked if the resolves here should mandate the delegates to vote against secret ballots on this issue.

Rowan – Responded that she would support any amendment that was against secret ballots.

Corpus Christi Student - Asked what the current landscape of equality reps is at NUS.

Rowan – Responded that there are no FTO trans officers except for the London trans

officer and that there are no paid trans officers on a student level, and as trans people tend to be disadvantaged economically, this is very important.

Barnaby Raine (Wadham) – Suggested that we add to the amendment that even if the vote does go to a secret ballot, delegates are still mandated to show how they have voted.

Hilary Chow (Kellogg) – Asked what full time officers are in place at the moment.

Rowan – Answered that currently, within the LGBT campaign, there is an open trans officer and a women’s trans officer, however there is no place on the NEC that can be occupied only by a trans officer.

No opposition to amendment.

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Clarified to council that the first amendment to the motion will mean that any future delegates to NUS Conference have to do the priority ballot which is emailed out beforehand and should report back to council on that for accountability purposes.

Amendment received:

To add to resolves:

4. To mandate future NUS delegates to vote against any secret ballot on a Trans Full Time Officer.
5. In the event of a secret ballot, to mandate delegates to show their delegation leader their ballot papers, who will then report back to Council on their votes.

Proposed: Annie Teriba (Wadham)

Seconded: Barnaby Raine (Wadham)

No opposition to amendment.

Motion passed as amended with no opposition.

m. Motions to amend Bye-Laws, General Regulations or Election Regulations

1. Bye-Laws Final Reading Motion

Council Notes:

1. Appendix 1 after this motion written by Internal Affairs Committee to summarise the proposed amendments.
2. The mandate on the current sabbatical team to undertake a campaigns governance

review.

3. The ongoing Quinquennial Review of OUSU's top level of governance, the Articles of Association, which these amendments lead towards.
4. The rolling governance review conducted over the past 2 years.
5. That there will be consequential amendments to the General Regulations and Election Regulations that will need to be made in Trinity Term.

Council Believes:

1. That the proposed amendments are good, as they are more reflective of the way in which OUSU works, and as they ensure that:
 - a) Bye-Laws are clearer and easier to read, and provide more direct delegation of governance to more students (such as for Campaigns)
 - b) Council has slightly more freedom to change the timings of Statutory Elections, if that is what students want
 - c) Postgraduate Strategy Summit is changed from a formal body that is not clear or productive, to a newer, less restrictive forum for graduate discussion (details at a later Council)
 - d) Sabbatical Officers-elect have a week's break at the end of Trinity Term before starting their terms of office
 - e) The current "Budget (Sub-) Committee" is distinct from the Trustee Board, reflecting its purpose as an advisory group
 - f) The Trustee Board must make reasonable efforts to ensure at least one woman is on every one of its committees
 - g) Complaints Committee is independent from the Trustee Board, but otherwise continues its current existence
 - h) OUSU's campaigns have a clear structure, with their own constitutions and elected executive, while remaining accountable to Council and so students in general
 - i) Raise and Give (RAG) is clearly separated from other OUSU Campaigns, allowing it to continue with its good work
 - j) Media services remain independent of OUSU Policy and be governed also by people with experience of media.

Council Resolves:

1. To give a Final Reading to the changes to the Bye-Laws outlined in Appendix 2.
2. To give a First Reading to amending Bye-Law 16.2 as follows: replace "9th Week of Michaelmas Term" with "9th Week of the Term in which the Part Time Officer was elected", and "8th week of Michaelmas Term" with "8th Week of the same Term".

Proposed: Louis Trup (Brasenose)

Seconded: Alys Key (Somerville)

Motion passed with no opposition.

a. Motions authorising expenditure

2. Funding for 'Sex, Relationships and Disability: A day of workshops and training for staff and students'.

Council Notes:

1. There is £1877.50 remaining in the Council Discretionary Fund for 2014-15.
2. OUSU's commitment to campaigning for the four liberation groups that it recognizes, including disabled students.
3. That "OUSU recognizes that Sexual Consent Workshops may not be accessible to all students (e.g. because the materials are triggering, or because of a disability), and should seek to provide alternatives." (Policy passed HT15)
4. That despite the plethora of welfare services available to students at Oxford University there is a relative paucity of resources, discussion and training available to give disabled students support and guidance about sex and relationships.
5. A relatively large-scale event would kick-start work in this area, and enable the Disabled Students' Officer to make a strong case for more sustainable funding for this kind of project.
6. There is currently no obvious source of funding for projects lead by members of the Part-Time Executive.

Council Believes:

1. A day of workshops and training for both disabled students and staff who support disabled students would begin to rectify the lack of support and guidance about sex and relationships.
2. This event would complement the general Sexual Consent Workshops and Disabled Consent Workshops (piloted HT15) that OUSU currently runs.
3. It would be valuable for the day to aim¹ to:
 - a. Raise awareness of the prejudice and lack of understanding surrounding the sexual needs of adults with disabilities;
 - b. (Consider the ways to) empower adults with disabilities to discuss and take part in responsible, loving romantic relationships;
 - c. (Consider the ways to) empower adults with disabilities to discuss and take part in responsible sexual behaviour;
 - d. (Consider ways to) promote the need for equal access to mainstream sexual health services for students with disabilities.

Council Resolves:

1. To support 'Sex, Relationships and Disability: A day of workshops and training for staff and students' with £800 from the Council Discretionary Fund. A full proposal is attached as appendix 3, but the estimated broad costs are:
 - a. £440: Travel and accommodation for 8 trainers/speakers (see full proposal for suggestions). This estimate is based on 4 trainers from Oxfordshire (average of £10 for travel) and 4 trainers from the rest of the country (average of £50 for accommodation and £50 for travel).

¹ Emulating the objectives of the work done by the *In Touch Project* (Leonard Cheshire Disability 2013)

- b. £250: Payment for training sessions. This estimate is based on 5 trainers receiving a payment of £50.
 - c. £60: Lunch for trainers
 - d. £50: Refreshments throughout the day
2. To mandate the Disabled Students' Officer, with support from the Vice-President (Welfare & Equal Opportunities) and the Vice-President (Women), to run 'Sex, Relationships and Disability: A day of workshops and training for staff and students' in Michaelmas Term 2015.
 3. To mandate the Disabled Students' Officer to report to Council on the event during Michaelmas Term 2015 or Hilary Term 2016.

Proposed: Lindsay Lee (Wadham)

Seconded: Anna Bradshaw (Wadham)

Lindsay Lee – Introduced herself as the part-time exec Disabled Students' Officer and informed council that they are asking for £800 of the discretionary fund to hold a day long training and information session for students and staff about the intersection of disability and sexual health and relationships. Added that the proposed schedule for the day is attached in the appendix. Explained that disabled people have very specific circumstances that are never addressed so this would be a ground breaking event. Recognised that it is a big chunk of money but stressed that it a really important thing to do. Informed council that the plan for the future is to do this al for ourselves this year and then hopefully pass on the cost to the disability advisory service, holding it as an annual event.

Motion passed with no opposition.

3. Funding for Women's Garden Party

Council Notes:

1. There is £1877.50 remaining in the Council Discretionary Fund for 2014-15.
2. OUSU's commitment to supporting and campaigning for the four liberation groups that it recognizes, including women students.
3. The Women's Garden Party is seeking funding from a variety of places, and has secured £100 from another OUSU budget and £25 each from some of the participating groups. (The total budget for the event, including the money requested in this motion, is £350.)
4. The success of similar projects in the past, including the Women's Societies Garden Party in 2014 and the WomCam Love Your Body Garden Party in 2011, 2012 and 2013.
5. OUSU's commitment to hold more family friendly events (HT15).

Council Believes:

1. That providing spaces for women to relax, have fun and network is an important aspect of supporting them, particularly in Trinity Term (when the majority of University examinations take place).

2. That encouraging collaboration between different groups of women is valuable.²

Council Resolves:

1. To support a Women's Garden Party with £150 from the Council Discretionary Fund. This money would go towards parts of the Party including:
 - a. Food and drink
 - b. Face painting
 - c. Craft activities for children and adults
 - d. Decorations³
2. To mandate the Vice-President (Women) to coordinate the Women's Garden Party in the first half of Trinity Term (so that it is before the majority of University examinations).

Proposed: Anna Bradshaw (Wadham)

Seconded: Aliya Yule (Wadham)

Anna Bradshaw – Explained that the event which this money is for is one which has been run in a number of different forms over past years, and this is one intended to bring all different groups together. Added it will be a big, welcoming and family friendly event, which creates a space for self and community care. Added that money has been found to fund this event from a number of different places already, and this will be just one of these contributions.

Kristina (St John's) – Asked if, considering that this is a family event, will people's sons be allowed to attend, and if so, what is the age limit.

Anna – Answered that the event will actually be open to all genders, however there will be workshops that are closed to specific groups. Added that her understanding is that if you advertise something as a women's garden party, the men that turn will be the nice ones that you want there.

Will Obeney (Regent's) – Asked if this should be put in a budget of some sort for the longer term, as it has come up on a number of occasions.

Anna – Answered that this is a bigger event and perhaps a more sustainable model, however it needs to be proven to work before it can go into a budget line.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Asked if there was not a case for holding this event after University examinations.

Anna - Agreed that there was a case for this, however they had decided that the vibe that they were aiming for is relaxing and restorative rather than a big party with alcohol. Hoped that

² The Garden Party will involve Women's Societies, college Feminist Societies, OUSU Campaigns, zines and other relevant groups.

³ Other costs, covered by funding from other sources, include: publicity; activities including a mindfulness workshop; blankets and borrowing furniture; music and other performances.

people could use it as a break from study to relax, and added that there are already many events set up for post-exams.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – Asked if there was a venue yet.

Anna – Answered that outdoor space at St John's is being used, however there will also be the opportunity for closed indoor workshops.

Motion passed with no opposition.

4. E&E Divestment Campaign

Council Notes:

1. That Council unanimously supported in MT2014 a motion from E&E Campaign to endorse the principles of transparent and climate-sensitive investment, and specifically the following recommendations:
 - a) Systematically evaluate carbon risk across the entire investment portfolio;
 - b) Actively manage the carbon risk exposure of its portfolio with the aim of steadily shifting investments away from high-risk, carbon-intensive assets and toward low-carbon opportunities;
 - c) Remove from its portfolio all direct investments in coal and tar sands oil assets as soon as possible;
 - d) Develop a strategy to effectively engage with policy-makers, financial regulators and corporate management, notably by becoming a member of the Institutional Investors' Group on Climate Change (IIGCC).
2. OUSU has worked with the University using appropriate committee processes in order for a decision on climate-sensitive investment to be made for the past two years.
3. On the 16th of March, the final decision-making body, University Council, met to make a decision on climate-sensitive investment. The decision was deferred until 4th week Trinity at which we expect a final decision to be made on whether to implement our recommendations.
4. There is currently £1800 left in Council's discretionary budget
5. There is currently £334 left in E&E's annual campaign budget

Council Believes:

1. The deferral of the decision on divestment by the University is very disappointing, and capitalises on the assumption that students will be too busy during exam season to keep campaigning.
2. The next meeting of University Council is a pinch-point for OUSU's divestment campaign, at which we will either succeed or fail.
3. E&E should be doing all it can to keep the pressure mounting on the University to adopt the recommendations in Notes 1.
4. The University is particularly susceptible to public actions, and media attention.
5. That organising and promoting a public action is likely to cost more than the £334 left in E&E's budget.

Council Resolves:

1. To re-affirm support for E&E's divestment campaign, and the specific recommendations in notes 1.
2. To allow E&E to use up to £200 from Council's discretionary fund (if necessary) to organize and promote a public action before the next meeting of University Council to show the strength of support for divestment within the student body, and within the wider community.

Proposed: Ruth Meredith (Brasenose)

Seconded: Rivka Mickelthwaite (Balliol)

Ruth Meredith – Explained that this motion comes from the back of a previous motion, when E&E thought they were finally going to get an answer from the University regarding fossil fuels, and whether they believe that they are unsustainable and unethical. Continued that we have spent the last 18 months pushing the University on this and have received nothing but a deferral in response. Explained that this motion is consequently asking for two things: firstly for £200 from the discretionary fund to be used to plan and run a rally which aims to show the University that they cannot wait us out, and secondly for students to re-affirm your support for divestment and make public your anger with this wait. Added that we have jumped through every hoop possible for this, and have caused the biggest internal conversation on divestment to date. Expressed frustration that she is bound by a restrictive confidentiality policy which prevents her from sharing the discussions of this meeting, so she wants students to help show their anger and determination that the University cannot wait us out, and that we will not give up. Urged council to vote in favour of this motion

St Benet's student – Asked what exactly the University will be lobbied for.

Ruth – Explained that the University are being lobbied on the four points listed in Council Notes 1.

Motion passed with no opposition.

b. Other motions

5. Motion to support On Your Doorstep's opposition to Oxford City Council's proposed Public Spaces Protection Order on rough sleeping

Council Notes:

1. That Oxford has the second highest level of homelessness per capita in the country
2. That Oxford City Council have proposed to implement a ban on rough sleeping (amongst other behaviours, eg. pigeon feeding, dogs off leads, unlicensed busking) in the 'city centre' (map attached) by using a Public Spaces Protection Order, on the

grounds that it “has a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality” and makes other residents and tourists feel “uncomfortable.” Violation of a Public Spaces Protection Order is a criminal offence and leads to an £100 fine or prosecution.

3. That Oxford City Council have not formalised proposals yet but will meet to do this on May 5th, and a formal decision on the Public Spaces Protection Order will be made on May 14th. Oxford City Council have however stated that the Public Spaces Protection Order would only be used to deal with “entrenched rough sleepers” who have refused an offer of accommodation
4. That the On Your Doorstep Campaign has started a petition on change.org objecting to the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order, which has gathered nearly 70,000 signatures. The campaign’s stance has been supported and mirrored by a range of homelessness organisations in Oxford including Crisis Skylight, the Big Issue, Aspire and Oxford Homeless Pathways.

Council Believes:

1. That On Your Doorstep’s petition shows that there is a significant amount of public disapproval, both from students and local residents, of the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order.
2. That the Public Spaces Protection Order is not a supportive, compassionate or positive way to help rough sleepers in Oxford. If Oxford City Council’s primary aim was to help rough sleepers, they would not do so using a law that pushes these vulnerable people further away from support and services, and into potentially more dangerous situations.
3. That evidence of the efficacy of enforcement based approaches to entrenched rough sleepers remains inconclusive
4. That treating rough sleepers as a problem, threat or inconvenience to tourists and residents in the city, rather than as individual human beings with rights, is unacceptable
5. That even if entrenched rough sleepers refuse accommodation, they should not be forced into doing so by a law that could have further detrimental effects on their chances of improving their situation (e.g., giving them criminal records makes it harder for them to obtain employment as a path out of homelessness). Moreover, many rough sleepers have complex needs which mean that they don’t want to accept hostel accommodation, e.g. mental health issues, PTSD, fear or relapse into drug or alcohol habits, fear of assault and crime.
6. That Oxford City Council should work with the homelessness sector to find a more compassionate way to help rough sleepers who want to move out of homelessness

Council Resolves:

1. To support On Your Doorstep’s opposition to Oxford City Council’s proposals, with the ultimate aim of Oxford City Council removing rough sleeping from the list of behaviours it seeks to ban under the Public Spaces Protection Order.
2. To mandate the OUSU Executive to sign an open letter (which can be drafted by On Your Doorstep if this is appropriate), to be submitted by May 5th, to the officials in charge of the Scrutiny committee, expressing our concerns over the proposals.

Proposed: Freya Turner (Hertford)

Seconded: Emily Silcock (New)

Freya Turner – Explained that Oxford City Council are proposing to implement a ban on rough sleeping in Oxford city centre using something called a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO). Argued that this sort of campaign is not a compassionate way to help rough sleepers, and treating rough sleepers as a threat or inconvenience, rather than as actual human beings with rights to be in their city is not acceptable. The council state that this will be focussed on entrenched rough sleepers, who have previously refused accommodation. Urged council to support this motion and for exec to sign an open letter expressing our concerns with this proposal.

Gail Braybrook, (Worcester) – Asked what the council expect these people to do.

Freya – Answered that breach of a PSPO is a criminal offence with a fine of £100 and prosecution if you don't pay. Added that the details of the proposal have not been released to us so we have no clear knowledge on if they would enforce this.

Nikhil Venkatesh (Corpus Christi) – Asked if they have been in touch directly with the Council.

Freya – Responded that On Your Doorstep have produced a petition on change.org which has been sent to them, and letters and requests for information has been sent to various different officers and councillors and all they say is that proposals are still being considered.

Chris Casson (St Catherine's) – Asked if it would be a good idea to wait to do this motion until we have more information.

Freya – Responded that they are opposed to PSPOs being used in this way in principal, as it is meant to be dealing with anti-social behaviour. Explained that it covers things such as letting dogs off leads, essentially behaviour which is chosen by the person and can be prevented, which is not the case for rough sleepers. Added that it is particularly dangerous for female rough sleepers, who are at a higher risk of assault outside the city centre and away from CCTV cameras.

Alex (Worcester) – Asked what the deadline was for this.

Freya – Responded that they want to ensure that in the time between now and the final council meeting at the start of June there are as many opposition letters to the council as possible. Noted that the date given of May 14th in the motion is no longer correct, as they were told two days ago that the final decision would be made in June.

Jacob Page (St Catherine's) – Asked if this kind of action has been used anywhere else in the UK.

Freya – Answered that it had not been used against rough sleepers.

Alex (Worcester) – Suggested that this would be a good idea to allow JCRs to respond to this.

Gail (Worcester) – Suggested that we would be in a better place to negotiate with concrete facts.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) – Stated that waiting these things out tends to mean it is too late to negotiate. Added a further point that we have to remember that students have a huge impact on housing and rent prices in the city, and that we therefore have a level of complicity in homelessness within the city and we have to take this seriously. Stressed that it is a problematic way of looking at homelessness to assume that people have an obligation for example to get clean before they are offered help.

St Benet's – Stated that is already illegal so this PSPO would simply be a case of enforcing what is already in place. Added that without knowing what the plans are, he would be uncomfortable voting in favour of the motion.

Emily Silcock (New) – Stressed that by the time the exact plans are announced it will be too late for us to do anything, and added that as On Your Doorstep is not autonomous, we need the support of Council on this.

Move to vote.

No opposition.

Freya – Re-iterated that this is not a compassionate way to treat people. Informed council that the City Council are not obliged to publish their proposal until 24 hours before their scrutiny committee meets to make a decision, therefore not giving us enough time to do anything.

Vote

For – 61

Against – 0

Abstain – 1

Motion passed.

6. Education Vision

Council Notes:

1. The motion it passed in Michaelmas term mandating the Vice-President (Access & Academic Affairs) to produce an OUSU Education Vision.
2. That OUSU officers and staff subsequently sent out a survey, which [953](#) students filled in, and held [11](#) focus groups around colleges and liberation groups during Hilary Term. [Further data analysis was done from the 8,881 responses from the 2014-15 Student Barometer and 1824 responses from the 2013/14 National Student Survey](#)
3. That a first draft of the Education Vision (Appendix 4) has now been produced.
4. That the final Education Vision needs to be approved at 3rd week Council in order for it to go to University committees this term.

Council Resolves:

1. To discuss the first draft of the Education Vision for a period of time determined by the Chair after the passage of this motion, and feed back its comments to the sabbatical officers.

Proposed: James Blythe (Brasenose)

Seconded: Jack Matthews (University)

James Blythe – Explained that the motion itself is simply agreeing to have a discussion on the Education Vision, which will come back to be passed as policy in 3rd week.

Motion passed with no opposition.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – proposed to suspend rules so that speeches are no longer that one minute each.

No opposition.

Kat Jones (Pembroke) – Stated that she is obviously in favour of campaigning priority 3, and that her only issue is with clarity. Explained that she would not be in favour of expanding bursary at the expense of outreach, as our bursary package is already huge and outreach is essential.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) – Stated that there is a question about vague language such as targeting access and wanted to know the intention behind this.

James – Answered on the first point that they are one package and he can come back with clearer language, and on the second point, he felt there was a need for a proper access vision, as access simply lead into this as a part of academic affairs, which began as the focus.

Rowan Davis (Wadham) – Stated that she is working on campaigning on trans inclusion in the medical curriculum and wondered if James would support this.

James – Answered that it would be wonderful.

Will Obeney (Regent's) – Asked if there should be something which focuses on access for mature students, including their options within part-time courses and Continuing Education. Added that he was unsure about the opposition to massive open online courses, as these might be useful in the future.

Joanna (St Hilda's) – Stated that teaching opportunities for graduates is of such importance to their career opportunities that she would welcome a change in phrasing to 'we will actively campaign for more opportunities', rather than just supporting them.

Alex (Regent's) – Suggested that the vision refers to constituent bodies to include permanent private halls.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) – Suggested that it would be nice to have a more concrete commitment to having a more liberating academic programme which filters through to the contents of the course.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Added to Annie’s point that they have just begun a curricular review on diversity in the humanities division, and having OUSU behind this would be a great addition.

James – Stated that he is happy to go away and make the curriculum section clearer, but this is where he included the work on diversity. Suggested they talk about it offline so they can find some language that works.

Will Obeney – Explained there is a school of thought to suggest that massive open online courses would be a way to enhance the student experience in the future, and perhaps we could add a caveat that it could be a good thing if it does not take away from the very personal way in which Oxford works.

Louis Trup - Acknowledged that online courses are an important thing for OUSU to consider, as we are yet to engage with this at all. Confirmed he would support a change that makes us open to the idea of online courses, providing student support etc. does not suffer.

James - Informed council that he is not opposing online courses entirely and he can put a comment on outreach in, however we are not ready as a University to do anything radical in the next three years.

Jack Matthews (University) – Reinforced that we haven’t had much discussion today about graduate issues, and for the first time, this document makes a commitment to post graduate access. Stated that it doesn’t matter that there are not many graduates in the room as this is something that should concern us all. Urged council to submit suggestions regarding this.

c. Any other business

1. Quinquennial Review – See Appendix 5

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Explained that OUSU are obliged to review their articles every five years, which is a long process that needs sign off from us, the University and the Charity Commission. Reminded council that this has already been to them in numerous forms and asked them to have a further look through and raise any issues which they may have.

Jack Matthews (University) – Asked Louis if it is true that it is monumentally important that we get this right so it really is key that people read this.

Louis – Agreed with Jack.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) – Asked if anyone would be interested in bringing a motion to council to campaign to change the 1994 Education Act so that this does not have to happen.

Louis – Informed council that they have already taken a motion to NUS wanting to change parts of the Act so they have a precedent to do so and he personally agreed that we should.

Rowan Davis (Wadham) – Pointed out that the motion mentioned by Louis was passed at NUS Conference.

2. Trustee Board Report – Appendix 6

James Elliott (St Edmund) – Briefly ran through the main points that were discussed at the previous board meeting, including funding for the Oxford Hub, the complaints procedure and the Quinquennial Review. Added that one element picked up in the QR was how student trustees are elected. Flagged the issue of confidentiality around the trustee board, and explained that Louis will bring a paper on this to the next meeting, but stressed that all student trustees are in favour of as much transparency as possible.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) – Asked if there was any discussion on how external trustees should be selected.

James – Answered that to his knowledge, this has not been discussed in the QR process. Stated that the NUS guidelines recommend that you have external trustees, but that they do not have voting powers.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Highlighted that the external trustees that we have are highly useful and can put very valuable hours and experience in that we do not yet have the capacity to do as students.

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Explained that the board is deliberately made up so that students can out vote externals, and also if the sabbs were ever to be dodgy the students and externals can joined up. Added that the board rarely votes on anything.

Rowan Davis (Wadham) – Suggested that the externals should only have an advisory role.

Louis – Agreed this is an important discussion but doubts there will be time for it within this QR process.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Reported that the First Response App which Council helped to fund has now been made and is great.