

Council Minutes

3rd Week Michaelmas Term 2014

3rd Week Council took place at 5:30pm on Wednesday 29th October 2014, at St Anne's College, Mary Ogilvie Lecture Theatre.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, please feel free to contact the Chair, Anna Bazley, at chair@ousu.org.

- 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. Passage of Motions without discussion
- i. Motions of No Confidence or Censure
- j. Emergency Motions
 - 1. Motion to Apply for Council Discretionary Funding to Help Fund
Mature Student Orientation
- k. Motions Authorising Capital Expenditure
 - 2. The Oxford French Law Society Motion for Funding
- l. Other Motions
 - 3. Supporting Free Education Demonstration in November
 - 4. Council holding the Executive Committee to account
 - 5. Direct Election Voting System
 - 6. Quinquennial Review
 - 7. #VeggiePledge Posters
 - 8. General Election
 - 9. Suggestion Box
- m. Any Other Business
 - a) Undergraduate Bursaries and Fee Waivers & Access
Programmes 2016/17
 - b) Nominations Pack

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Stated that his name had been spelt incorrectly.

b. Matters Arising from the Minutes

None

c. Ratifications in Council

None

d. Elections in Council

Graduate International Students' Officer – Jingjing (Alice) Wang (St Catz) nominated.

No hust requested.

Alice – 77

RON – 1

SBV – 5

Alice Wang was elected.

MPLS Undergraduate Divisional Board Representative – Julien Coyne (Brasenose) nominated.

No hust requested.

Julien – 76

RON – 1

SBV - 6

Julien Coyne was elected.

3 Positions for Budget Sub Committee – Nick Cooper (St John's) nominated.

No hust requested.

Nick – 75

RON – 3

SBV – 6

Nick Cooper was elected.

1 Position for JS(EC)SM (Joint Subcommittee of the Education Committee with Student Members) – Adam Roberts (Wadham) and Raj Dattani (St Peter's) nominated.

Adam – Introduced himself as a PPE student from Wadham. Informed council that he was VP of his student union last year, and currently sits on OUSU Complaints Committee. Explained his primary reason for wanting to sit on the committee is that it is the ideal place to discuss visiting students and the types of changes that we may wish to see regarding them. Recognised that it is an important committee and claimed that he had relevant experience to sit on it.

Raj – Introduced himself and informed council that he is currently the divisional board

representative for medical sciences. Explained that he wants to be on this committee as it is an important forum where we can push issues for students, and key for enabling us to be a critical friend of the University. Stated that he has relevant experience and would like to bring up the issue of housing, particularly the fact that there is going to be £900 million spent on buildings around Oxford, only £30 million of which is intended for housing.

Adam – 44

Raj – 35

RON – 0

SBV – 4

Adam Roberts was elected.

1 Position for Rules Committee – Olayinka Oduwole (Kellogg) nominated.

No hust requested.

Olayinka – 76

RON – 1

SBV – 6

Olayinka was elected.

e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Explained that his report this week would not be covering anything detailed in his written report, but would be an explanation, an update and a thank-you. The explanation would be regarding the OSSL board's decision to remove Amelia Hamer as editor of The Oxford Student. Clarified that this decision was taken because according to part 24 of schedule 3 of OUSU's General Regulations, the editor must consult the general manager of OUSU if they have a concern about an article regarding its legal or reputational concerns. Added that this process had not been followed, and as a result the decision to remove the editor was taken. Moved on to the update, which was regarding the suspension of Chris Pike, OUSU's VP for Welfare and Equal Opportunities. Stated that the suspension was issued by the CEO the previous evening following a complaint received through OUSU's complaints procedure. All complaints are confidential to ensure the welfare of those involved. Added that this meant that the sabbatical team were not aware of the details and asked council to consider the welfare of those involved when this issue goes through the press. Informed council that the sabbatical team have been working to cover the workload in the absence of the VP WEO and an email have been sent out detailing this. Confirmed that Anna Bradshaw would be the first point of contact with himself as the second. Added that all emails are also currently forwarding to him. Thank-you – on Friday night many emails were sent around regarding a missing student. Updated council that this student has now been found safe and gave huge thanks to those that shared the message

and pulled together as a community.

Anna Bradshaw (Wadham) – Reiterated what Louis said and urged people to contact her if they are unsure who will be able to help with a particular element of Chris's work.

Requested that council look at her written report but noted that there is an error which states the Common Room Superhero Handbook is online. Apologised that this has not yet happened but stated that she has hard copies available. Encouraged council to come and speak to her with any questions.

James Blythe (Brasenose) – Informed council that he has three updates to make on his written report. Firstly, he and Ruth visited the Inter-University Centre in Blackbird Leys, which is a joint project between Christ Church and the University, to run a range of widening participation initiatives in their community. Explained that this will be launching in February and aims to inspire the next generation in Oxford. Secondly, great access rep forum last night, which consisted of a very stimulating debate on free education. Thirdly, drew attention to his point on AOB and encouraged council to stay for this.

Yasser Bhatti (Green Templeton) – Reported one big win, OUSU has been able to shoulder its way into Oxford Innovation Working Group. There was previously no student representation on this but we as a sabb team worked together to achieve this. Three student positions are now on this group. Also working on extending the bus card discount scheme that staff have privilege to but students don't. Flagged the fact that we still need a PG MPLS divisional rep. Stated that tomorrow is the deadline for International Student Campaign elections. Reminded council that you are not required to be an international student to stand for this.

Ruth Meredith (Brasenose) – Flagged On Your Doorsteps' Homelessness Awareness Week which is going very well. Tonight there is an event at Freuds so urged people to come along. Tomorrow night, a set of talks about the experiences of being homeless. RAG Ball will take place on Friday. Went to a community grants group where we got funding for a youth club in Rose Hill to support a video project for young people to learn how to use video equipment and develop communication skills. Start of living wage week next week.

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

Xav Cohen (Balliol) – Advertised a new campaign called 'Veggie Pledge' – a voluntary campaign for students to pledge to be more veggie during November, from veggie once a week to vegan all month. Encouraged students to take posters about this for their common rooms.

Will Neaverson (Christ Church) – Informed council that Christ Church GCR has re-affiliated.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Attended a meeting of the board last week last week and pushed student issues including housing and meeting at some point with the head of the division to discuss this further. Will be meeting with GMC next week, and with the Educational Policy Standards Committee in the coming weeks.

Lucy Delaney (Wadham) – Advertised a Feminism and Theory in Action conference on Saturday at Wadham.

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

Helena Dollimore (St Hilda's) – Asked if an update could be made regarding the NUS Referendum. And if council would ever be told about this in the future when the proctors' investigation is complete.

Louis Trup – Explained that the proctors would be informed as an interested party once the investigation is complete, but would not be able to publicise the information received.

Helena – Asked if individuals would be named.

Louis – Confirmed they would not be named. This is beyond our power.

Raj – Asked the sabbatical team how the Oxford Innovation Working Group links to Isis Innovation.

Yasser Bhatti – Explained that it is a working group which comprises of many different divisions, departments, communities as well as Isis Innovation, Begbroke Science Park, Oxford Entrepreneurs, so essentially the student element was missing. We want students to be integrated in the process.

Raj – Asked if students will be on the board of Isis Innovation.

Louis – No, Isis Innovation is separate. However I met with various people from here this morning to talk through various thoughts and ideas.

Davis Townsend (St John's) – Understands that OUSU are not in a position to publicise any names but asked if OUSU can agree to communicate how the interference in the NUS referendum took place and what steps will be taken moving forward.

Louis – We will communicate anything we are able to. Reminded council that the previous team and the OUSU staff decided to move to a new voting system following the voided referendum.

Chris Tomlinson (Harris Manchester) – Raised a concern regarding the conduct of the VP Access and Academic Affairs.

Danny Zajarias-Fainsod (Wadham) – Interrupted and stated that this is not a question and should perhaps instead be submitted to the complaints committee.

Anna Bazley – Ruled that this was an issue for complaints, not for council.

Anna Bazley – Read out the following questions that had been emailed to her by Samuel Moss (Jesus):

1. How is the VP for Welfare's role being filled currently?
2. Are we aware of how long the VP's suspension will last?
3. Can the President tell us when the complaint will be heard?

Stated that the first question had already been covered and asked the sabbatical team for a response to the second two.

Louis – Stated that the time frame is undefined and in the hands of complaints committee. Added that it is being heard by complaints committee but in terms of being made public, this will only happen if it reaches the stage of a formal panel. It will be appropriately anonymised if this happens.

h. Passage of Motions without Discussion

5. Direct Election Voting System

Council Notes:

1. That under Election Regulation 32.2, OUSU's voting system must provide for:
 - a. A secret ballot
 - b. A person entitled to vote, being able to vote only once,
 - c. A person entitled to vote, to abstain,
 - d. Electronic counting
 - e. Where appropriate, access for voting to be restricted in order to comply with Regulation 30.1 or 31.1,
 - f. System access, by a person entitled to vote, to a relevant manifesto, and
 - g. General system access to be restricted to

- i. The Returning Officer
- ii. The General Manager,
- iii. OUSU's democratic support officer, and
- iv. One or more persons authorised jointly by the Returning officer and the General Manager.

A person with general system access under (i) to (iv) must not deny access to another such person.

Council Believes:

1. That Mi-Voice no longer suits our needs and requirements,
2. That a voting system based on the University's Single Sign-On details is more intuitive, secure and easy to use for members,
3. That MSL's electronic voting system fulfils all the requirements set out in Election Regulation 32.2.

Council Resolves:

1. To approve the use of MSL (Membership Solutions Ltd.) electronic voting system for OUSU's Direct Elections.

***Proposed:* Martine Wauben (Pembroke College)**

***Seconded:* Louis Trup (Brasenose College)**

This motion passed with no discussion.

7. #VeggiePledge Posters

Council Notes:

1. #VeggiePledge is a campaign that has organically grown from the fertile soils of Balliol JCR.
2. #VeggiePledge is endorsed by the OUSU Environment & Ethics Officer (the proposer of this motion) as an environmentally focussed campaign.
3. #VeggiePledge is aimed to be a university-wide campaign to encourage vegetarianism, veganism, and the general giving up of meat and animal products during November.
4. People participate in the campaign by pledging to go vegetarian for the month or vegan for 5 days a week, for example, during November. Participants can tailor their own pledges.
5. #VeggiePledge is meant to be a mostly online campaign and inter-collegiate competition, with promotion on Facebook, twitter, and our website. Participants will be encouraged to have a transparent #VeggiePledge logo on their Facebook profile pictures.

6. #VeggiePledge could also feature physically in common rooms, if money is found for posters.
7. 150 A3 posters cost around £35.
8. NUS gave OUSU a £1000 grant for their involvement with Green Impact in 2013-14, which has yet to be spent. The conditions on the grant are that it should be spent on environmentally friendly projects. Spending is at the discretion of the Vice-President (Charities and Community).

Council Believes:

1. The promotion of vegetarianism and veganism as more ethical and environmentally friendly lifestyles is a good thing in our community.
2. #VeggiePledge will promote vegetarianism and veganism in a non-confrontational way.
3. #VeggiePledge is a good campaign.
4. #VeggiePledge will benefit from having posters up in common rooms and appropriate locations in the university.

Council Resolves:

1. To endorse the VP Charities and Community and the Environment and Ethics Officer's decision to spend £35 from the NUS Grant for #VeggiePledge posters.
2. To promote #VeggiePledge through relevant OUSU channels, such as the President's email and OUSU's Facebook and twitter account.

Proposed: Xav Cohen (Balliol)

Seconded: Ruth Meredith (Brasenose)

This motion passed with no discussion.

8. General Election

Council Notes:

1. There is a general election coming up in May.
2. OUSU's charitable status limits the issues on which OUSU can campaign.
3. The OUSU trustee board is responsible for ensuring that OUSU operates within the law.

Council Believes:

1. As a representative body of Oxford University students, OUSU is well placed to campaign on issues students care about in the run up to the General Election.
2. OUSU Council should set the OUSU policy on the issues that students care about.
3. All students should have the opportunity to highlight the issues they care about.
4. OUSU should provide opportunities for the student voice to be heard at a local and national stage.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the President to create an online method through which all students can submit issues they feel OUSU should campaign on in the run up to the general election.
2. To mandate the OUSU Executive committee to write motions about the issues they see as the most recurrent or important from the online submission.
3. To mandate members of the OUSU Executive Committee to bring these motions to the four council meetings of Hilary term, allowing us to have a complete 'OUSU manifesto for the 2015 General Election' by Wednesday 4th March 2015.
4. To send this manifesto to all parliamentary candidates standing in the two constituencies Oxford University students reside in during term time.

Proposed: Louis Trup (Brasenose College)

Seconded: Ruth Meredith (Brasenose College)

This motion passed with no discussion.

9. Suggestion Box

Council Notes:

1. OUSU has an image problem: at the last count 36% of students were satisfied with us (Source: Tom Rutland, 1st Week Trinity Term 2014 Report).
2. More could be done to increase student engagement with OUSU; students who engage are 92% satisfied with us.

Council Believes:

1. That giving students more of a say at what happens in OUSU will increase our satisfaction rate.

Council Resolves:

1. To support the creation of an official OUSU web-based suggestion box similar to the (successful) one that St Catherine's College JCR currently operate (<http://jcr.stcatz.ox.ac.uk/ideas/>).
2. To consider the best way(s) that the most appropriate proposals from the student body could be translated into OUSU Council motions.
3. To mandate the OUSU President to report back to council in 1st week Hilary term on how progress is going.

Proposed: Christopher Casson (St Catherine's College)

Seconded: Louis Trup (Brasenose College)

This motion passed with no discussion.

i. Motions of No Confidence or Censure

None.

j. Emergency Motions

1. Motion to Apply for Council Discretionary Funding to Help Fund Mature Student Orientation

Council Notes:

1. That Mature Student Orientation happened on 11th October 2014 and was co-organised by OUSU's Mature Student Campaign and Student Services, University of Oxford.
2. That the overall cost of the orientation was £910, which included tea/coffee, lunch and venue hire. All of the speakers gave up their Saturday morning and did not charge a fee.
3. That to cover a large portion of the bill MSC used £300 from its 2013/14 campaign funds and secured £300 from the JCR of HMC, leaving a deficit of £310.
4. That MSC applied unsuccessfully for funding from the University and from the local business community.
5. That this was the first event of its kind at Oxford, with over 100 mature students attending.
6. That it was successful with much positive feedback and many connections between the mature student community made.
7. That it successfully established the new mature student committee.
8. That the University is working to programme Mature Student Orientation into its main orientation programme from MT15.

Council Believes:

1. That Mature Student Students are an important part of the University, roughly amounting to 900 undergraduates and approximately 2500 postgraduates.
2. That Mature Student Orientation is a good idea to welcome and help integrate this student group to University life.

Council Resolves:

1. To help cover the cost of Mature Student Orientation by giving £310 from Council Discretionary Funds.

***Proposed:* Henry Procter (Linacre College)**

***Seconded:* Yasser Bhatti (Green Templeton College)**

Yasser Bhatti – Informed council that Henry was unable to attend council this evening and

that he would be speaking on his behalf. Stated that the Mature Students' Campaign recently held their first ever orientation. To pay for the event, MSC spent £300 from their own funds, which is half of their yearly budget, received £300 from Harris Manchester JCR, and have £310 left to find.

Anna Bradshaw (Wadham) – Asked in what way this is this not going to be repeated next year.

Yasser – Answered that the campaign had to provide proof of concept to the University, who are interested in taking it upon themselves next year.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Asked why this was not budgeted for correctly.

Yasser – Explained that MSC were very much banking on gaining sponsorship funds for this event from businesses and also applied to the VC discretionary fund but unfortunately neither of these options worked out.

Kat Connolly (Trinity) – Asked who has currently paid.

Leonie Smith (Harris Manchester) – Responded that it has not yet been paid but if we don't raise the money she would be paying for it. The only other option is to use the remaining funds in the MSC budget. Explained that the campaign did everything they could to raise the funds.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Asked who the money is owed to.

Yasser – Harris Manchester College.

Motion passes with no opposition.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Proposed a procedural motion to move motion 4 up the agenda.

Vote on procedural motion:

For – 47

Against – 16

Abstain – 6

Motion 4 moved up the agenda.

4. Council holding the Executive Committee to account

Council Notes:

1. Its duty to scrutinise certain OUSU office-holders.
2. Its decision in 1st week, Trinity Term 2014 to ask the Board of Trustees, which the Executive Committee is part of, to engage more effectively with Council.
3. That no part of this motion affects the right of any Student Member to bring a motion of censure or No Confidence to Council under any circumstances.

Council Believes:

1. That many Sabbatical and Part Time Officers work hard in the interests of students, and that this work should be communicated to students.
2. That a fundamental responsibility of members of the Executive Committee is to report their work to Council.
3. That Council should hold officers who do not report their work to Council to account.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate all Executive Officers [the Sabbatical and Part Time Officers] to:
 - a. Provide a written report to (or where not possible, a verbal report at) and;
 - b. Attend (or where not possible, send apologies for); every Ordinary Meeting of Council.
2. To mandate all Executive Officers to attend (or where not possible, send apologies for) every meeting of the Executive Committee.
3. To mandate the President to communicate the list of attendance and apologies to each meeting of Council and of the Executive Committee to the Chair of Scrutiny Committee.
4. To mandate the Chair of Scrutiny Committee (along with another member of the Scrutiny Committee of the Chair's choosing) to bring to Council a motion of censure against an Executive Officer, in the event that the Chair of Scrutiny Committee becomes aware that the member has failed to fulfil *either**:
 - a. **Both** of the mandates in Resolves 1, at two Ordinary Meetings of Council, *or*;
 - b. The mandate in Resolves 2 at two meetings of the Executive Committee.
5. To permit the Chair of Scrutiny Committee to disapply the requirement of Resolves 4 where, in the Chair of Scrutiny Committee's opinion, exceptional circumstances apply that explain the Executive Officer's actions.
6. That, for the avoidance of doubt, the mandate in Resolves 4 does not apply to any conduct before the date on which this motion is passed.
7. To make Notes 3, all of Believes, and Resolves 1 - 5 Policy Guidelines.

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's College)

Seconded: Eden Tanner (St John's College)

* There wasn't an easy way to word this, but essentially this. If an Officer fails to turn up to Council without apology, or if they do not report to Council, that counts as one strike. If any

of these things happen at a second Council, this mandate kicks in and the censure motion must be brought. Similarly, if an Officer fails to turn up/apologise to two separate meetings of the Executive Committee, a censure motion must be brought.

Amendment:

In the motion name, after "Executive Committee", insert "and Divisional Board Representatives"

In Believes 1, after Part Time Officers, insert ", and Divisional Board Representatives,"

To insert the following Resolves 2 (and renumber Resolves 2-7 accordingly):

"To mandate all Divisional Board Representatives to attend (or where not possible, send apologies for); every Ordinary Meeting of Council, and to encourage them to provide written reports to every Ordinary Meeting of Council."

In Resolves 7 (now Resolves 8), to replace "Resolves 1-5" with "Resolves 1-6".

Proposed: Emma Alexander (Keble)

Seconded: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Explained that this motion is brought to council as a way to re-introduce a way to hold our executive committee to account. Added that it is an attempt to ensure that officers are doing the jobs they were elected to do. Stated that there has been an amendment to include the divisional board reps, which has been accepted as friendly.

David Townsend (St Johns) – Asked if there are currently any rules in place governing this.

Eden – Responded that there is basically nothing with the exception that anyone can bring a motion of no confidence or a motion of censure against these officers.

Received an amendment from Jamie Wells.

Jamie Wells (Corpus) – Explained that his amendment was basically a re-wording as how it is written at the moment sounds like you could submit a written report every week and never turn up to council.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Asked if he meant without apologies?

Jamie – Confirmed that he did.

Nick – Explained that this would still count as a strike as the motion says 'has failed to fulfil both of the mandates in Resolves 1, at two Ordinary Meetings of Council' which means that they have to have failed to have fulfilled both of those mandates, meaning if they fail to fulfil one of them, that counts as a strike. Recognised that it is a little messy.

Jamie – Responded that he read it differently and asked council if they considered the motion to be clear enough. With no one stating it was not clear enough, the amendment was withdrawn.

The motion passed with no opposition.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Proposed a procedural motion to move motion 6 up the agenda.

Procedural motion opposed.

Vote on procedural motion.

For – 14

Against – 57

Abstain – 7

Procedural motion fell.

k. Motions Authorising Capital Expenditure

2. The Oxford French Law Society Motion for Funding

Council Notes:

1. The Oxford French Law Society is a registered society of Oxford University.
2. The Oxford French Law Society is comprised entirely of law students doing a year abroad in France to learn French law.
3. The Faculty of Law presents departing students with relatively little information as to the practical aspect of the year abroad.
4. That funding is required for the society to be able to host events for its members.

Council Believes:

5. That students should have the opportunity to get to know one another before embarking on a difficult year abroad.
6. Events help to create a sense of kinship between the departing students which will increase their confidence and reduce stress and fear of loneliness while in a foreign country.
7. Events allow the departing and first year students to meet students returning from the year abroad and therefore gain knowledge and experienced advice about the practical aspects of the year abroad.

Council Resolves:

1. To provide the French Law Society with funding worth £200.

Proposed: Maia Perraudeau (Somerville College)

Seconded: Joe Smith (Somerville College)

Maia Perraudeau (Somerville) – Informed council that 3rd year law students taking a year abroad do not really have any funding this year. Stated that they would normally receive funding from external firms but have been really struggling this year. Added that going to study french law abroad can be very difficult and scary and it can really help to go as a strong team. Requesting funding to hold an event where these students can spend some time together before their year abroad, but also so that we can get the 4th year students to come and meet up with them so they can gain information on what to expect and how to prepare.

Danny Zajarias-Fainsod (Wadham) – Asked where this money would be coming from.

Anna Bazley – The discretionary fund.

Danny – Questioned how much is currently left in the fund.

Anna - £1490.

Will Obeney (Regent's) – Asked what exactly is the money going to be spent on.

Maia – Responded that the venue would hopefully be provided by colleges, but they were hoping to host speakers and would ideally like to provide refreshments.

Anna Bradshaw (Wadham) – Asked if there are other European Law Societies that you could consider working with.

Maia – Answered that Italian Law have just 2 students going abroad and that Spanish Law only have one so it is unlikely.

Anna Bradshaw – Asked how many French Law students there are.

Maia – Around 15 in my year and approximately 45 in total.

Josh Platt (Hertford) – Asked if they had approached the law society for money.

Maia – Responded that they don't currently have any links with them.

- Asked if the French Law Society have any intention of incorporating the larger student body, considering that they are asking for a large sum of money from OUSU.

Maia - Responded that this is currently centred on those students that will be going abroad.

Opposition to the motion.

Jack Matthews (University) – Informed council that he does consider this to be a worthy cause but stated that he thinks that passing this motion would open up many applications from clubs and societies to the discretionary fund. The society that is asking for money is a registered club of the university. There is 9.2k in the clubs and societies funding budget. Not only can the Clubs Committee fund, they can help to provide information and support to make such events sustainable in the future. Concluded that they should apply to the Clubs Committee and states that with a strong application they should receive all the funding they need.

Vote

For – 2

Against – 66

Abstain – 6

Motion fell.

Maia – Thanked Jack and stated that she understood his opposition. Added that she had no knowledge of the Clubs Committee previous to this meeting but would look into this option. Advised OUSU to make information about this fund available.

I. Other Motions

3. Supporting Free Education Demonstration in November

Council Notes:

1. Recently the National Union of Students voted to campaign for a new deal for education, that is free, publicly funded, accessible, and funded by greater progressive taxation and clamping down on tax avoidance.
2. Free education is also the policy of the University and College Lecturers' Union (UCU), and the Trades Union Congress (TUC).
3. Germany has recently abolished tuition fees.
4. Contrasting the model of free education adopted by Germany, UK Conservative and Liberal Democrat politicians have made several statements calling for uncapped tuition fees, while our own Vice-Chancellor asked that fees be raised to £16,000 in a speech last year (condemned by OUSU at the time).

5. The NUS is supporting a national demonstration for free education on November 19th.
6. The success of previous campaigns NUS has run that OUSU has supported, such as the postponing of cuts to Disabled Students Allowance and the cancelling of the student loan book sell-off.

Council Believes:

1. We face a clear choice in education funding: either our system is going to continue down the road towards an American-style model of private universities with uncapped fees, or we can take it closer to a German model of free, public and accessible education.
2. The German model of free education is preferable to the current UK system of high fees, debt, cuts to staff wages, and privatisation of the education system.
3. Tuition fees and associated marketisation have decisively failed to create a sustainable funding system for universities.
4. In order to fund tuition fees, the Government can now expect to loan in excess of £10 billion per year, much of which it will never recover.
5. Fees act as a deterrent to access, making education seem unaffordable to some.
6. Large public investment in access schemes, funded by this system, is a sustainable way to fund the extremely vital access initiatives our university needs.
7. Access is a public benefit, and as such requires a public-owned and funded education system rather than the current model of privatisation, fees and debt, which does nothing to incentivise good access schemes.
8. That national coordinated action, through bodies like the NUS, is the best way to achieve national policy changes from political parties, as evidenced by recent campaign successes.
9. With a year until the general election, there are clear opportunities to make substantial gains for students, if we put out a clear message and mobilise the movement.
10. That the threat of uncapped tuition fees requires a strong response from the student movement.

Council Resolves:

1. To support free education as a policy and the NUS campaign against fees and debt.
2. To make 'Council Resolves 1' OUSU's policy on education funding.
3. That this motion does not affect the negotiating stances of OUSU's executive in deliberations with the university on funding, bursaries or grants, but rather reflects our intervention in national policy-making.

Proposed: James Elliott (St Edmund Hall)

Seconded: Annie Teriba (Wadham College)

James Elliott (St Edmund) – Stated that the debate around this issue can be summed up by the question 'what is education for' – a human right and a social good, rather than a commodity which can be sold for a profit. Argued that the system as it stands is not financially sustainable. Informed council that most JCRs that have voted in support of Free Education. Tuition fees increase educational inequality. This year the NUS vote to support the TUC on free education. The free education model was adopted just a few

weeks ago by Germany. The UK currently rates at the bottom of Europe for higher education funding. This situation could get much worse. Last year, our own VC called for an increase in fees while conservative ministers have discussed removing caps on fees altogether. We need to mobilise students to make us heard in this debate. Last year, we supported NUS campaigns again against cuts to DSA and against the privatisation of student loans. On both of those issues, students won, by using the collective power of the student body. This fight will be much longer but if we pull together as a student body we can still win. Let's make sure we're not standing on the sidelines.

David Townsend (St John's) – Asked what percentage of students complete undergraduate education in Germany.

James Elliott – Responded that he didn't know.

David – Asked how he knew about the financial sustainability of a free education model compared to Germany without this information.

James – The way the policy is formed states that we have two very distinct directions that education could go in and this is one of the options.

Annie Teriba – Clarified that when we are talking about affordability, we are not talking about spending more money overall, but about the proportion that is spent on education.

Josh Richards (University) – Also curious about the citation of Germany and whether that means we would be supporting a reduction in students and further emphasis on apprenticeships as happens in Germany.

James – Clarified that he is simply using Germany as an example of a country that appeared very unlikely to abolish tuition fees but that has managed to achieve this.

Chris Casson (St Catz) – Stated that he had a quick short factual question for the chair and asked if it is best to propose an amendment now or in debate.

Anna Bazley – Responded that it is fine to propose one now.

Chris Casson – Asked if we adopted this, would it prevent us from accepting an offer from a political party to reduce fees.

James Elliott – Stated that we need a goal of what we want education to look like and strive towards that.

Annie Teriba – Stated that this is an ideological position and that OUSU has policy on a number of issues that cannot be immediately achieved but are things to work towards. In the general election, whichever party is the closest to free education would be the party that this policy would lean towards, but that doesn't mean that we cannot keep campaigning beyond that and arguing that it is not enough.

Chris Casson – Would you accept an amendment to remove references to Germany in the motion?

James Elliott - Confirmed that he would accept this as friendly.

Amendment received:

Remove the references to Germany from Council Believes 1 and Council Believes 2.

Proposed: Chris Casson (St Catz)

Seconded: Jack Hampton (St Catz)

Amendment accepted as friendly.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – Questioned if the motion covers international students.

James Elliott – Confirmed that it does not.

James Blythe (Brasenose) – Stated that a very constructive debate has been taking place but argued that council should take policy that is both principled and pragmatic so that when your representatives go to negotiate with the University, they are taken seriously and listened to. Stated his belief that there are ways to do this in a realistic way. Added that even if we were to spend the money it would take to make this a reality, he does not believe that this would be the best way to spend several billion. Argued that as a student movement, we should not be as self interested as this. Spending this on secondary education would make a much bigger difference. Urged council to oppose the motion.

Annie Teriba – Confirmed that this motion does not tie any of the OUSU officers in negotiations with the University to a particular policy position. Believes it is important to remain to commit ourselves to ideological positions and argues that the idea that this is a self-interested policy is ludicrous. If you genuinely believe that the only people who benefit from people studying are those that study themselves, then there would be no reason to fund education in any sense of the word.

Amendment received:

To add to the end of council resolves 2:
'and make council resolves 3 a policy guideline.'

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Annie Teriba (Wadham)

Amendment accepted as friendly.

Jack Matthews (University) – Argued that he does not consider this motion to be sustainable and does not consider it to be fully thought through. Added that when similar

motions have been supported in the past, they have been fully costed. Whatever position we take, we need to carry more than students, we need to carry the general public to the ballot box to vote for it. The general public want to know exactly where money is going to come from and exactly how it will affect them.

Amendment received:

To replace resolves 1 with:

‘To support free education campaigns as a policy and the NUS campaign against fees and debt.’

Proposed: Danny Zajarias-Fainsod (Wadham)

Seconded: Marina Lambrakis (St John’s)

Not taken as friendly.

Danny Zajarias-Fainsod (Wadham) – My reason for adding the word campaigns is that we should all support campaigns and demonstrations behind this, but should not complicate it by tying ourselves to a long-term policy before it has been further developed. This is basically a call to support a demonstration so surely the resolution should talk about supporting campaigns.

Josh Platt (Hertford) – Asked if Danny is aware that common room reps are mandated to vote on this motion, not an amended version.

Danny – Aware of people being mandated. The support of the policy would cover support of campaigns and further policy could be voted on in the future.

Barnaby Raine (Wadham) – Asked if Danny is aware that the last OUSU council voted to support the demonstration and the motion was split so we could vote on policy this week.

James Elliott – Added that the way in which the motion was split and tabled is why the title remains. There was a decision that this week the vote would be on policy. This is what JCRs have been voting on and it would be very unfair to amend the motion after this.

Move to vote on the amendment:

For – 4

Against – 60

Abstain – 6

Amendment fell.

Move to vote.

Vote on motion.

For – 46

Against – 17

Abstain – 7

Motion passes.

6. Quinquennial Review

Council Notes:

1. Under the Education Act 1994, the University's Council is required to review OUSU's constitution every five years. As OUSU was incorporated in July 2010, the time has come for the first review.
2. OUSU's trustees have a parallel obligation to carry out such a review with the University (Article 9 of OUSU's constitution)
3. Following the first review group meeting, five issues have been identified for discussion:
 - a) Should sabbatical officers be able to run for re-election to a second term?
 - b) Currently, sabbatical officers also serve as charitable trustees of OUSU. There are certain restrictions laid down in law as to who can be the trustee of a charity (eg. people who are bankrupt or have a conviction for dishonesty are disqualified). Should someone who is disqualified from being a trustee be able to serve as a sabbatical officer?
 - c) The University is a corporate member of OUSU. This means that in General Meetings, as well as all ~22,000 students getting a vote each, the University gets one too. Is this OK?
 - d) How should the Executive, Council and the Board work alongside each other?
 - e) Who should be bound by policy created by Council (eg. sabbatical officers, trustees, OxStu, equal opps campaigns)? How can we make the way policy works clearer?
4. The student representatives on the Review Group can't mind-read, and don't know what the prevailing opinion on these issues is among OUSU's members.

Council Believes:

1. All students, including members of Council, should have to have the opportunity to contribute to the review of OUSU's constitution.
2. Council discussion of these issues would be useful so that Council understand issues properly and can fully contribute to the review.

Council Resolves:

1. To encourage members to contribute to the consultation by filling out the survey in Louis's next weekly email, or by emailing president@ousu.org or margery.infield@seh.ox.ac.uk

2. To ask Common Room representatives to make their Common Rooms aware of the review and how they can contribute to the consultation
3. To ask Internal Affairs Committee to contribute to the consultation and to identify any other issues not already highlighted
4. To mandate the student representatives on the Review Group to report back to 7th Week Council, after the second meeting of the Review Group.

Proposed: Margery Infield (St. Edmund Hall)

Seconded: Louis Trup (Brasenose College)

Margery Infield (St Edmund) – Explained to council that there have been several questions raised in the quinquennial review process so far which it would help to gain the opinions of students on before presenting them to the University. Listed the question in council notes 3.

Will Obeney (Regent's) – Asked if question (c) could be clarified.

Margery – Explained that this would give the University a vote in the event of a general meeting, however this will be only want vote as opposed the approximately 22,000 of the students.

James Elliott – Asked if there is currently an idea of when the general meeting will take place.

Louis Trup – Responded that the aim is to have it at the end of Trinity Term but both the Charity Commission and the University could affect this.

Motion passed with no opposition.

m. AOB

- a) Undergraduate Bursaries and Fee Waivers & Access Programmes 2016/17

James Blythe (Brasenose) - Informed Council that he is a member of the Joint fees and student Support Advisory Group (JFSSAG) and is presenting the recommendation which they are pitching to University Council for the 2016/17 package of bursaries, fee waivers, other forms of student support, and spending on access and outreach. Added that OUSU Council is one of the bodies that has been asked for its views.

Reported that JFSSAG don't think that fee reductions/fee waivers are the most effective method of helping people and wish to remain with the principle agreed last year of not

wanting to have them. They will be kept for Moritz-Heyman scholars. It will be ensured that money previously spent on the fee waivers will be spent making sure that we can be as generous to everybody in the poorest income bracket as Michael Moritz is to Moritz-Heyman scholars. Everyone under 30k will get enough money to live without needing any contribution from work or parents. Requested comment on any of the above points.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Asked what the difference is between a Moritz-Heyman scholar and someone who is receiving an Oxford bursary.

James – Explained that approximately 50% of students in the 0-16k group are Moritz-Heyman scholars. They are the most disadvantaged people in that group. Predicted that as we receive more and more money from Moritz, it will all 0-16k people that receive this.

Daniel Turner (Balliol) – Questioned why 30k cut off point and what the drop off is for support after the 30k limit?

James – Responded that the number of bands have been increased this year so that the drop off is less. The drop off at 30k is £235, which they have to provide from another source. 30k was chosen as you have to pick a point somewhere. This was chosen in 2015/16.

Raj – Asked if households with an income above £42,650 get no support at all.

James – Confirmed that is correct.

James – Moved to the next point and reported that the number of bands will be increased from 7 to 11. Stated that 11 is the maximum that you can use as that is the maximum in Student Finance England's system. More bands results in the drop off at each level being smaller. For example, previously, the difference between 25k and 30k was £1500 and is now approximately £700. Asked council if they considered this to be a good idea and received approval from the room.

James – Moved to the next proposal that everybody who gets a bursary should have access to financial support for an internship. Currently Moritz-Heyman scholars receive access to a £2000 pot once during their degree to support them to complete an internship. They can spend that on travel, accommodation etc. The proposal from JFSSAG would provide everyone under the 42k cut off to the same access. Estimated that this would cost between £500,000 and £2million depending on how many people decide to take it up. Asked the room for thoughts. Approval from council.

James Holliday (St Hugh's) – Asked if the current people who receive Moritz-Heyman money for internships need to show what they are spending the money on.

James – Confirmed that they have to justify the need for the cost.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Asked if could be specified that these are funds that could only be used if students were not receiving the support from the company providing the internship.

James – Confirmed that this is intended for companies that cannot provide that support, in particular charities.

Raj – Asked if Moritz-Heyman scholarships replace student finance money or if it is in addition.

James - Confirmed that it is in addition. Moritz-Heyman scholars get £3208 of extra money as they still receive government support and Oxford support. Explained that this extra money is designed to mitigate debt aversion. Added that some students use the extra money to take out less of a tuition fee loan or save it towards towards postgrad study, but can ultimately use it how they wish.

Jack Matthews (University) – Questioned if this proposal will keep us at the status as the most generous university in the country.

James – Stated that we don't know what other Universities are planning, however we are currently significantly above most.

Council were supportive of this proposal.

James: Raised a final point that JFSSAG is proposing that in principle, over the next few years, they will find a way to reduce the package down from a steady state of 44.3% to a steady state of about 40%.

Catherine Jones (Pembroke) – Asked who decides on the split between bursaries and other access initiatives.

James – Responded that JFSSAG would be the place to propose any changes to the package. Added that the plan is to see how the general election goes prior to making any significant changes.

Raj – Queried if the total sum includes OUSU spending on access.

James - Explained that OUSU spending is a tiny percentage made up of £2000 for Target Schools and part of his own salary.

Helena Dollimore (St Hilda's) – Asked if The Oxford Bursary goes up in line with inflation and if so which index.

James – Responded that it goes up or down through the JFSSAG process and added that tuition fee do not go up with inflation.

Helena – Confirmed she was referring to household income boundaries.

James – Answered that these are set by Student Finance England.

On the final point, there was a broad feeling across Council members that in the current situation a target reduction in spending in this area could not be justified.

b) Nominations Pack

Martine Wauben (Pembroke) – Updated Council that the nominations pack for the OUSU elections is now available online and encouraged all to have a look through it.