

# Council Minutes

## 3<sup>rd</sup> Week Michaelmas Term 2015

3<sup>rd</sup> Week Council took place at 5:30pm on Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> October 2015, at St John's College, Garden Quad Reception Room.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, please feel free to contact the Chair, Jack Matthews, at [chair@ousu.ox.ac.uk](mailto: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 and questions to the Sabbatical Officers, Executive Officers, Divisional Board Representatives, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (*Raise and Give*)
- f. Emergency motions  
*The motions titled 'Oxford Students' Academic Freedom' has been withdrawn by the proposer and seconder, with the permission of the Chair.*
- g. Passage of motions without discussion
- h. Motions of No Confidence or censure
- i. Motions to amend Bye-Laws, General Regulations or Election Regulations
  1. Final Reading of a Motion to Amend the Bye-Laws
- j. Motions authorising expenditure
  2. Supporting #GrantsNotDebt Demonstration in November
- k. Other motions
  3. Standards of Research Supervision
  4. Paper-free Council
  5. University Committees
  6. Support for medical students concerning reforms to the junior doctor contract
  7. Motion to Accept the Trinity Term 2015 Scrutiny Report
  8. Preventing Prevent
- l. Any other business
  1. Student Written Submission
  2. Disability, Sex and Relationships Workshop 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

No ratifications in Council.

---

#### **d. Elections in Council**

**Graduate Social Sciences Divisional Board Representatives** – Jonathan Lakey (Christ Church) nominated.

No hust requested.

Jonathan – 67

RON – 4

SBV – 6

**Jonathan Lakey was elected.**

---

#### **e. Reports from and questions to the Sabbatical Officers, Executive Officers, Divisional Board Officers, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (*Raise and Give*)**

Lucy Delaney (Wadham) – Noted that she had not produced a written report this week, due to illness. Reported that she has put the sanitary scheme in place, and has done a massive bulk order of products, which will be available to colleges over the next week. Informed council that when receiving feedback about consent workshops, she has also been receiving feedback about race workshops, and she has heard that colleges did not provide enough space and attention to race workshops, and will consequently be writing a report for colleges about formalising the process of these workshops, so the success of the workshops is not compromised.

Emily Silcock (New) – Informed council that she organised dinner with the E and E reps, who were really keen and really great. Urged council to read her report for more information.

Becky Howe (Pembroke) – Reported that she has been meeting with JCR presidents to hear about their plans for the year, working on the Oxford University Festival, which will be launching in Hilary Term, and planning the common room presidents training day, which will be taking place on Saturday 7<sup>th</sup> November.

Cat Jones (Pembroke) – Informed council that her priority over the last two weeks has been supporting other student representatives, by running an access forum, an academic reps forum, meeting with all the divisional board reps, the part time exec linked to her position, and the chairs of Target Schools.

Ali Lennon (St John's) – Reported that we have some fantastic feedback going to the NHS on GP practices, which is really important, and that along with Cat, he is launching the new suspended status students campaign.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Urged graduate students to run in the elections, as we need to ensure that OUSU represents everyone. Flagged a meeting of the International Students' Campaign on Saturday.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Asked if MCR presidents are invited to the suspended status students campaign.

Ali (St Johns) – Confirmed that they are and some have already signed up.

Gareth Sessel (Harris Manchester) – Informed council that he is brand new to the job of Academic Affairs Campaign Officer, and has had meetings with Cat Jones, and will be working on the Suspended Status Students' Campaign and on college feedback. Invited students to contact him on [academicaffairs@ousu.ox.ac.uk](mailto:academicaffairs@ousu.ox.ac.uk).

Lauren McKarus (St Catherine's) – Reported that last Saturday there was a joint graduate and undergraduate event, which was great. Reported that we want to engage more graduate students this term with more social events, including international beer tasting.

---

## **f. Emergency motions**

Jack Matthews (University) – Explained that the emergency motion has been withdrawn by the proposers with the permission of the chair.

---

## **g. Passage of motions without discussion**

### 5. University Committees

#### **Council Notes:**

1. This is not the most interesting motion. Sorry.
2. Students are now represented on most University committees that discuss issues affecting students.
3. The terms of reference for these committees have developed over time, and are very varied in specifying how students are chosen.
4. Some specify that OUSU Council should choose that student.
5. Existing Policy (passed MT14) states that Council delegates its decision for University Council and Museums Board membership to the Sabbatical Officers.
6. The Vice President (Graduates) is writing a paper to the University asking for student representatives to have votes on committees, and as part of this, is asking the University to update its various terms of reference to reflect current practice.

#### **Council Believes:**

1. Student representation on University committees is crucial if we are to have our voice heard.
2. It is of most help for Sabbatical Officers to fulfil these roles where possible, as they work full-time and are aware of discussions (often confidential) from other committees.
3. Clarity of who will sit on various committees is useful.
4. It is important (where not confidential) for Sabbatical Officers to feed back their discussions in University committees to students, via Council or otherwise.

#### **Council Resolves:**

1. To permit the Sabbatical Officers to speak in favour of amending the terms of reference of certain committees that are always sat on by Sabbatical Officers (University Council, IT Committee, Museums Board, Planning & Resource Allocation Committee, Security Subcommittee) so they no longer state that student representatives will be elected by OUSU Council.
2. To mandate the Sabbatical Officers to maintain Elections in Council for the current positions on Rules Committee, the Joint Subcommittee (of Education Committee) with Student Members, and the Committee for the Language Centre.

**Proposed:** Nick Cooper (St John's)

**Seconded:** Catherine Jones (Pembroke)

**Motion passed with no discussion.**

#### 7. Motion to Accept the Trinity Term 2015 Scrutiny Report

**Council Notes:**

1. The Scrutiny Committee was established in Hilary 2010 to monitor the work of the OUSU team, and ensure they are held accountable to the students of the university.
2. The Trinity Term 2015 Scrutiny Report was referred back to the Scrutiny Committee.
3. Over the vacation, the Scrutiny Committee thoroughly reviewed the report.

**Council Believes:**

1. That the revised report in Appendix 2 can now be accepted.

**Council Resolves:**

1. To accept the Scrutiny Report in Appendix 2.

**Proposed:** Alastair Graham (St John's)

**Seconded:** Benji Woolf (Christ Church)

**Motion passed with no discussion.**

---

### **h. Motions of No Confidence or censure**

---

#### **i. Motions to amend Bye-Laws, General Regulations or Election Regulations**

##### 1. Bye-Law Amendment

**Council Notes:**

1. A very minor drafting error in the Bye-Laws, which creates an ambiguity.
2. That it has already agreed to a First and Second reading of the below amendment.

**Council Resolves:**

1. To give a Final 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:** Becky Howe (Pembroke)

**Seconded:** Nick Cooper (St John's)

Becky Howe (Pembroke) – Explained that this is simply correcting a small error in the bye-laws.

Hossein Sharafi (Keble) – Asked what the factual error was.

Becky – Explained that in the referendum last term, students voted for elections to take place in Hilary, and there was a reference that didn't make sense anymore because of this proposed change in timing.

**Motion passed with no opposition.**

---

## **j. Motions authorising expenditure**

### 2. Supporting #GrantsNotDebt Demonstration in November

*Supplementary information can be found in Appendix 1.*

#### **Council Notes:**

1. That George Osborne has announced plans to scrap maintenance grants for low income students in September 2016.
2. That Osborne has also announced that tuition fees will be set to rise above £9000 from 2017-18.
3. That the National Campaign Against Fees and Cuts (NCAFC) have called a national demo in London on November 4th against these cuts and for a free education.
4. That this demo is being supported by the NUS national executive committee.
5. That a full risk assessment of the demonstration is being undertaken by the NUS.
6. That NCAFC, working with NUS, have taken measures to ensure that the demo is as accessible as possible and there will be a disabled students' bloc at the front of the demo (see doc attached).
7. Last year, OUSU Council voted to support the NUS campaign for free education and put forward £200 to the cost of a coach to the national demonstration. It was also passed by fifteen JCRs.
8. At the last OUSU Council in 1st week a motion was passed opposing the abolition of maintenance grants.
9. OUSU is currently part of a national lobbying movement against the abolition of maintenance grants.
10. That Keble and Hertford JCRs have already passed £150 each towards the cost of organising Oxford coaches to the demonstration.

#### **Council Believes:**

1. That education is a social good.
2. That nobody should be denied access to that social good.
3. That maintenance grants provide a crucial way for many students to actually access higher education, and as such should not be abolished.
4. That cuts to these grants will disproportionately affect marginalised groups, in particular students from working class backgrounds and students with disabilities, for whom the grants are a lifeline.
5. 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.

#### **Council Resolves:**

1. To support the publicising of the demo by distributing the leaflets produced by NCAFC found at <http://anticuts.com/leaflets-and-posters-for-the-national-demo/> and donate £30 for the cost of the posters and leaflets from Council's discretionary fund.
2. To organise coaches from Oxford to the demonstration appropriate to the number of people who want to attend or who we expect to attend.
3. To sell tickets to students for the coaches, and to allow OUSU to be an admin on the Oxford Activist Network Facebook event for Oxford students attending the demonstration.
4. To pass £300 from Council's discretionary fund to go towards the cost of the coaches.
5. To mandate the OUSU President to email the student body with information about the demonstration and coach tickets, and publicise these in communications and online more generally.

**Proposed:** Xavier Cohen (Balliol)

**Seconded:** Lucy Delaney (Wadham)

Xav Cohen (Balliol) – Informed council that he believe this motion follows on very naturally from the previous meeting, where council passed a motion condemning the government's plans to abolish maintenance grants and replace them with more loans. Explained that they are now asking for institutional support from OUSU to organise coaches from Oxford, to go to a national student demonstration against these plans, as well as advertising the event and selling tickets. Informed council that £900 has already ben passed by colleges in support of this. Added that they are also asking for up to £300, but suspected that the majority of this will not be used, and will simply be in place as a buffer.

Aliya Yule (Wadham) – Suggested that we use the extra money to lower the costs of tickets if there is some left over.

Xav – Replied that we are aiming for a price that will hopefully not be an issue for any students, around the amount of £2-£3.

Tom Barringer (St Hugh's) – Asked if there is a set amount of money that OUSU has for the discretionary fund.

Jack Matthews (University) – Explained that there is £2500 at the start of the academic year, and there is currently £2200 remaining,

Hossein Sharafi (Keble) – Asked how we are balancing how much money each college gives, and the amount that will be returned if not all money is spent.

Xav – Acknowledge that he has not yet put enough thought into this, but assumed it would be proportionate to the amount that they had given.

Cameron Quinn (Merton) - Asked if there would be a deadline for people to book onto the coaches, and if so, when it would be.

Xav – Answered that this discussion would have to take place after the motion is passed, but hoped it would be as close to the demonstration as possible.

Colin Malaney (Queens) – Opposed the motion as he believes it is full of half truths and lies, arguing that education is not free without fees, it is paid for by the tax payer. Added that it is a

waste of OUSU's money to spend on the coaches, and could be much better spent elsewhere. Disagreed with the idea that loans block access, and urged that OUSU should be focussing on educating potential students about loans, and the fact that you do not have to pay them back until after you graduate.

Vote on motion:

For – 80

Against – 4

Abstain – 7

**Motion passed.**

---

## **k. Other motions**

### 3. Standards of Research Supervision

#### **Council Notes:**

1. Currently, the standard of supervision for research students across the University is inconsistent.
2. Divisions and faculties/departments have minimum requirements of supervision, but these are not monitored or enforced effectively.
3. Research requires skills that are very different to those developed in taught programmes (undergraduate and Masters), and good guidance in this process is extremely important.
4. Research can be a very isolating activity, particularly for those students not based in labs, and the role of the supervisor is crucial to the successful and timely completion of studies.
5. The OUSU Education Vision produced in 2015.

#### **Council Believes:**

1. Research students deserve a minimum level of supervision.
2. Research students contribute hugely to the academic life of this University.

#### **Council Resolves:**

1. To mandate the VP (Graduates) to consult with research students across the University about current standards of supervision, where it is lacking, and where faculties/departments could do more to monitor and enforce their own guidelines.
2. To mandate the VP (Graduates) and the postgraduate Divisional Board Representatives to work together to create a charter of minimum standards of supervision for research students, including monitoring and enforcement on the part of faculties/departments.
3. To mandate the VP (Graduates) and other relevant officers to lobby the University for this to be adopted and for more rigorous scrutiny of supervision standards to be adopted by faculties and departments.
4. To mandate the VP (Graduates) to report back to Council by the end of Hilary Term 2016.
5. To make Council Believes 1 and 2 OUSU policy.

**Proposed:** Marina Lambrakis (St John's)

**Seconded:** Rita Nissim (St John's)

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – Informed council that as a research student, sometimes your supervision is good, and sometimes it is terrible, and argued that consequently it needs to be standardised. Noted that the amendment is just for clarity.

**Amendment received:**

To add:

Council believes 3:

Research students deserve guidance on working hours, holiday entitlement, and parental and carers' leave.

Council Resolves 5:

To mandate the VP (Graduates), postgraduate divisional board representatives, and appropriate members of the executive to create guidelines on working hours, holiday entitlement and parental and carers' leave

Council Resolves 6:

To make Council Believes 1,2 and 3 OUSU policy.

**Proposed:** Jacob Page (St Cross)

**Seconded:** Marina Lambrakis (St John's)

Amendment taken as friendly with no opposition.

**Motion passed as amended with no opposition.**

4. Paper-free Council

**Council Notes:**

1. Approximately 1400 sides of paper are used per meeting of OUSU Council, on average. At 6g of CO<sub>2</sub> per sheet<sup>1</sup>, this adds up to 50.4kg of CO<sub>2</sub> per year.
2. Many of these paper copies are never read.
3. Currently, the planet is emitting greenhouse gases, such as CO<sub>2</sub>, at an unsustainable rate. This is leading to global warming, which leads to catastrophic environmental consequences.
4. Currently, when a projector is available, the agenda for OUSU Council is projected on a screen.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~lungj/blog/?p=6>

5. Some students have accessibility requirements that necessitate printed copies of Council papers.
6. OUSU is currently working towards the NUS Green Impact Award. This requires that “the paperwork for union council, or equivalent, is circulated by email rather than as hard copies”.

**Council Believes:**

1. OUSU should act, where possible, to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases produced.

**Council Resolves:**

1. To only print necessary papers for meetings of Council, including ballot papers, nomination booklets, voting cards and sign-in sheets.
2. To mandate the Chair of council to include in an email to voting members, that students may request printed copies of papers, prior to each meeting of council.
3. To mandate the Chair of council to improve the efficiency of the layout of necessary papers, in order to minimise the amount of paper required.
4. To supply printed copies for students who request them.
5. To make Resolves 1 to 4 OUSU policy.

**Proposed:** Emily Silcock (New)

**Seconded:** Fairlie Kirkpatrick Baird (Somerville)

Emily Silcock (New) – Noted that everything is covered in the motion, and that council uses a lot of paper, and she would like to make it paper-free.

Benji Woolf (Christ Church) – Asked if there would be a way to find out what the minutes are without having copies at council.

Emily – Answered that they are available online and if you haven’t read them beforehand, then you won’t have time to do so at the start of the meeting before they are passed anyway. Added that the elections in council booklet, ballot papers and voting cards would still be printed as they are necessary, and that report booklets would be online.

Wybo Wiersma (St Cross) – Asked if it would be easier to reduce paper as much as possible, but still have printed copies for those who do not have electronic devices.

Emily – Noted that they have said that they will print a certain number of copies for those who are new to council, and will continue those papers that are deemed necessary.

Jack Matthews (University) – Offered a Chair’s interpretation, and reported that the Steering Committee discussed this motion and it’s impact. Informed council that there would always be a small number of documents printed, and that anyone can email the Democratic Support Officer if they require additional copies of any papers printing.

Opposition received.

Lindsay Lee (Wadham) – Acknowledged the need to reduce paper use, however argued that OUSU already has a problem reaching out to new students at Council, an issue that will be made even worse if we do not provide them with agendas on arrival. Noted that the projector is not very clear at all, and the access issues will be particularly bad for disabled students, who may not be able to carry around electronic devices all day.

Christina St Clair (St John's) – Suggested that having people use their mobile devices may make them pay less attention in council.

Jacob Page (St Cross) – Agreed that the use of mobile devices can be difficult due to poor internet connection.

Benji Woolf (Christ Church) – Asked if there will be continuity of the system of printing on demand if staff members change over.

Jack Matthews – Answered that if it is in the motion and is made policy, then all officers should be made aware of it, as all officers should be following the policy book.

Emily – Acknowledged that we were worried about accessibility concerns when writing this motion, and agreed that there should be a few copies for those that are new to council, as well as an option for people to write in and request paper copies.

Eden Tanner (St John's) - Suggested that we print a regular amount of agendas, but not all other papers, as the agenda is the most critical document for students to be able to access council.

Lindsay – Agreed that we should print fewer agendas, however argued that we should be striving for a council where disabled students do not have to make specific requests, in order for council to be accessible for them.

Christina St Clair (St John's) – Suggested that we try out printing less next council and see how it works.

Emily – Explained that the motion is adjustable, in that it refers to necessary papers, and we can see what this means in practise on a trial and error basis.

Amendment received:

To delete the word “only” from Council Resolves 1.

To change Council Resolves 3 to:

‘To supply the usual number of agendas and 30% of the current number of all other documents.’

To delete Council Resolves 2 and 4.

**Proposed:** Anastasia Tsikas (Wadham)

**Seconded:** Isobel Cockburn (Wadham)

Tom Barringer (St Hugh's) – Questioned how we can print 30% fewer of a number that doesn't exist.

Emily – Confirmed that we don't have a usual number, and rather it depends on the motions coming, and how far through the term we are etc.

**Amendment withdrawn.**

Jack Matthews (University) – Informed council that currently, the Chair and the Democratic Support Officer how many copies of each paper of printed. Noted that we have already implemented some paper saving methods when compiling the papers.

Amendment received:

Add the words “and meeting agendas” to the end of Council Resolves 1.

Delete the “and” in the phrase “voting cards and sign in sheets”, for grammar.

**Proposed:** Tom Barringer (St Hugh's)

**Seconded:** Emily Silcock (New)

Amendment taken as friendly with no opposition.

**Motion passed as amended.**

6. Support for medical students concerning reforms to the junior doctor contract

**Council Notes:**

1. The BMA has pulled out of negotiations with NHS Employers over concerns the reforms will negatively impact on patient safety.
2. The current contract reforms relating to junior doctors are set to be imposed in August 2016 regardless.
3. These contract reforms will have a profound impact on final year medical students as well as subsequent medical students at the University of Oxford.

**Council Believes:**

1. Patient and doctor safety should be at the centre of contract reforms: The removal of disincentives for hospital employers to ensure safe working hours will dangerously overwork doctors and put patients lives at risk.

2. The removal of incremental pay progressions will disadvantage junior doctors working part-time, taking parental leave or pursuing further academic qualifications (e.g. PHD's).
3. Increasing social working hours to 7am-10pm Monday-Saturday will demoralise the workforce and encourage doctors to leave the country or change professions.

**Council Resolves:**

1. To support efforts by medical students at the University of Oxford to ensure reform to the contracts does not compromise their health and safety and that of their patients.
2. To support strike action by junior doctors should the results of the ballot (soon to open), support this outcome.

**Proposed:** Daniel Harris (St Peter's)

**Seconded:** Raj S Dattani (St Peter's)

Daniel Harris (St Peter's) – Stated that he considers this issue relatively straight forward, as it will affect all current final year medics, as well as all subsequent medical students. Urged that we should take a stance on this issue, and it is something that we can support logically, adding that these things move very quickly, so it is key that we need to make a statement of support now.

Yoni Stone (Pembroke) – Questioned what the proposers recommend the student body actually do in order to support this.

Daniel – Answered that taking an official position will enable us to use it as a platform to educate people on what is going on, and should initiatives come up that are relevant, we can use this stance in support.

**Motion passed with no opposition.**

8. Preventing Prevent

**Council Notes:**

1. The government's Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 places a statutory requirement on public bodies and 'specified authorities' – including universities – to prevent people being drawn into terrorism' and to implement the 'Prevent' agenda.
2. The Vice-President (Welfare & Equal Opportunities) has been invited by the University of Oxford to be involved in all areas of the implementation of the 'Prevent Duty'.
3. In February, over 500 academics - many from Oxford - signed an open letter condemning the Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill, declaring that it is "a threat to freedom of speech at Universities". Among them was Professor Robin Cohen, former Director of the International Migration Institute, and amongst other notable Oxford

figures to condemn the bill was Sir Ken Macdonald, Warden of Wadham, Lib Dem Peer and former Director of Public Prosecutions.<sup>23</sup>

4. Under Prevent, staff have been known to report students as being ‘at risk of radicalisation’ for merely taking an interest in political affairs in class, or for observing their religion more closely, whilst politically active students have found themselves visited by counter-terrorism officers.
5. The Prevent agenda, as part of the Government’s ‘anti-extremism’ work has been used to create an expansive surveillance architecture to spy on the public and to police dissent, systematically targeting Black people and Muslims
6. The Act further criminalises Muslims and Black people, and comes amidst a campaign of fear and demonisation from the government and the media.
7. Islamophobia is on the rise across Europe, is state-sponsored and legitimised by the mainstream media.<sup>4</sup>

### **Council Believes:**

1. That our university is a place for education, not surveillance.
2. The Act curtails the fundamental right of free expression, and discourages critical thought. Academics, as well as anyone in a public sector job, should not have to be part of this surveillance.
3. The Government’s counter-terrorism/security policy is fundamentally flawed in its approach: its operant concepts of ‘extremism’ and ‘radicalism’ are ill-defined and open to abuse for political ends.
4. That the Act could serve to isolate many students who already feel that the only avenue through which the Government will engage them is ‘anti-radicalisation’ initiatives, resulting in further alienation and disaffection.
5. The implementation of the Prevent Strategy on campus will not only isolate Muslim students but undermine the civil liberties of other groups such as environmental, political and humanitarian activists.
6. The government’s identified ‘warning signs’ of “radicalisation” problematise and renders suspect those with mental health difficulties.
7. That the National Union of Students (NUS) and University and Colleges Union (UCU) have both passed motions at their conferences opposing the Act and Prevent.
8. As a Charity, we as a Union are not legally bound to engage with Prevent and should seek to boycott it.

### **Council Resolves:**

---

<sup>2</sup> Academics condemn “repressive” Counter Terrorism bill  
<http://www.cherwell.org/news/uk/2015/02/06/academics-condemn-quotrepressivequot-counterterrorism-bill>

<sup>3</sup> Sir Ken Macdonald: ‘obnoxious’ anti-radicalisation measures attack campus free speech  
<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/ken-macdonald-obnoxious-anti-radicalisation-measures-attack-free-speech>

<sup>4</sup> Islamophobia hate crimes up by 70% - <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-34138127>

1. To publicly condemn the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act.
2. To mandate OUSU Officers to not co-operate with the Prevent strategy or serve on any bodies overseeing the implementation of Prevent, and to boycott it as far as legally possible.
3. To work with campus trade unions including UCU on combating the Prevent strategy and its implementation on campus.
4. To mandate the VP (Welfare & Equal Opportunities) to lobby the university to be completely open and transparent about how they are engaging with Prevent and other similar initiatives

This involves:

- i. Demanding publications of how the policy is operating within the university.
  - ii. Giving details of and access to the materials used to train staff and students on their Prevent duties.
  - iii. Holding consultations with the student body regarding how this affects students.
5. To mandate the Vice-President (Welfare & Equal Opportunities) to arrange assistance and support to any students who feel harassed or persecuted due to the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015.
  6. To mandate the Vice-President (Welfare & Equal Opportunities) to publicise and explain how the 'Prevent Duty' may affect students and the dangers of the CTSA.
  7. To mandate the Vice-President (Welfare & Equal Opportunities) to support common room officers in opposing any college level implementation of Prevent.

**Proposed:** Aliya Yule (Wadham)

**Seconded:** Nikhil Venkatesh (Corpus Christi)

Aliya Yule (Wadham) – Explained to council that earlier this year, the government passed the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act, which creates a legal obligation for public bodies, such as universities, hospitals and schools to comply with Prevent. Informed council that Prevent, is intended to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism and extremism, both of which are very very ill defined in the policy, with extremism including things like criticism of western foreign policy, and opposition to British values, with the government's guidance also including the targeting of not just violent, but also non-violent extremism. Explained that staff have been asked to monitor and report those that seem withdrawn, or want political change, therefore places such as the counseling services will be trained in how to look out for these signs. Noted that additionally, Prevent will give the University and the police the ability to enter any space without warning or reason, as well as allowing the University to vet any external speakers, monitor social media activity, and check up on our emails. Provided some examples that have already occurred nationally, including a DPhil student who was taken in for questioning because he was reading a book called 'Terrorism Studies', a 14 year old boy said the word eco-terrorist in a French class, and was taken in for questioning, and a 3-year old boy drew a picture of an aeroplane, and his parents were taken in for questioning. Stated that all of these people were Muslim. Acknowledged that it is true that any of us could be subject to this, argued that this legislation is a thinly veiled attack on Muslim communities, and that the way it is conceptualized suggests that religion drives extremism, which is an unsubstantiated view. Noted that it is great to see that OUSU will not be complying with Prevent as they are not

required to, and that this motion aims to extend this stance. Explained that we are asking that there are no students that sit on committees that are involve in implementing Prevent, as this would legitimise frankly racist legislation. Added that this does not mean that we cannot engage with it by opposing it. Urged council to prevent Prevent.

Joanna (St Hilda's) – Noted Council Notes 4, and asked where this has occurred.

Aliya – Answered that she does not know the exact institutions, and added that Prevent has been in place since 2012, and despite not being made a legal requirement until this year, there have been over 4000 referrals already.

Jacob Page (St Cross) – Stated that he is a Divisional Board Representative, and is therefore mandated to attend divisional board meetings, so asked what he would do if he was also mandated to not attend these meetings.

Aliya – Answered that he should send a note that council have mandated him not to attend, and advised that he writes a statement saying what a disgusting thing Prevent is, and refuse to help with the implementation of it.

Colin Malaney (Queen's) – Noted the reference to criticism of western foreign policy, and asked where this phrase is actually used in the documents.

Aliya – Replied that she does not have page numbers right now but stated that she has been through the guidelines and these are direct quotes that are widely known to be in the documentation.

Samuel Banks (Merton) – Asked if there will be information that we would be able to obtain if students are sat on the committees, that we will miss out on if they cannot attend.

Aliya – Answered that she did not think this is the case, as Ali made very clear in a meeting with him that the University are very keen to make this as transparent as possible.

Motion opposed.

Colin Malaney – Stated that he has gone through the documentation, and phrases that Aliya used are not actually in there, adding that it seems like an extremely reasonable guide. Noted that British values are defined as 'vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs'. Argued that this does not seem unreasonable, islamophobic or racist.

#### **Amendment received:**

To remove Council Resolves 2 and replace with:

To mandate the Vice-President (Welfare and Equal Opportunities) to continue to monitor and influence the process of implementation in order to safeguard students from the effects of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 and to publicise the implementation process as widely as possible.

**Proposed:** Ali Lennon (St John's)

**Seconded:** Becky Howe (Pembroke)

Not accepted as friendly.

Ali Lennon (St John's) – Explained that the process is still being shaped and formed, and that Lord McDonald, who opposes Prevent sits on only one committee, while he sits on all 5. Agreed that he informed Aliya that the process would be transparent, based on an assurance given to him by the registrar of the University, who has now retired from the most senior group, so there is no way of knowing if this still stands. Informed council that safeguarding students from harm is his top priority, and removing himself from these groups could have a harmful effect on the student body. Urged that OUSU needs to be involved and engaged in order to have any influence, and there is no way of knowing if the University is being transparent without attending these committees. Added that he has put projects on hold and failed to deliver on manifesto promises because he has put so much time and effort into this, and asked council to let him continue his work on this.

Amendment opposed.

Nikhil Venkatesh (Corpus Christi) – Stated that he has great respect for Ali, and believes that he is speaking in good faith, however disagrees with his proposed strategy. Noted that the University do not want to implement this, so it seems like we shouldn't be helping them to do it, and rather should be strengthening their resolve to not cooperate. Questioned why we need to be on committees if the University are in agreement with us and want to be transparent. Added that it is for students of colour and Muslim students to decide how they want to be represented, and they do not want OUSU to cooperate with Prevent.

Wybo Wiersma (St Cross) – Argued that this amendment weakens the motion to such an extent that it is not a motion anymore.

Ali Lennon – Informed council that he is in full support of this amendment, that he is inside so he knows what is going on, counseling services are not yet bound by this and he is trying to shape it so it remains that way. Noted that the academics who oppose this are not necessarily in the groups, and are also weighing up if they want to risk funding from HEFCE with complying with this to a great extent and going above and beyond what is necessary, rather than the light touch approach that he believes would make students safer.

Henna Shah (Regent's) – Informed that in her role she sees many people who feel alienated by the background before they even arrive at Oxford, and asked what kind of message we would be sending to them if we engage with this.

Zach Grader (St Catherine's) – Argued that we need someone on the inside in order to affect policy.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Stressed that we should make this vote on principle, and what we believe is right for the students, rather than predicting what will happen with certain agencies.

Imran (St John's) - Introduced himself as the president of the Oxford Islamic Society, and stated that there are many Muslims students who are very concerned about Prevent, even before they apply for the University. Asked council to stand together with them.

Yusef Robinson (St Hilda's) – Pointed out the students who are going to be the disproportionately affected by this, are all saying that they do not want OUSU to cooperate, and argued that Ali is not a paternal overlord who can determine what is best for those students.

Jacob Page (St Cross) – Asked for a clarification on how this will affect certain roles, as his single mandate is to attend divisional board meetings, and he cannot imagine how Prevent would not filter down into these meetings.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Asked if we cannot use these meetings to very loudly and vociferously oppose Prevent, and have our representatives in the meetings as a form of protest and not contribute but be in the meetings to report back.

Benji Woolf (Christ Church) – Asked if we could not send representatives to the meetings to see if they can in fact have any influence, and if they can't, then they should walk out.

Cat Jones (Pembroke) – Agreed with Eden. Clarified that this is a legal requirement and the University are going to do it, that OUSU are totally opposed to it, and that we need Ali on these groups in order to actually do Council Resolves 4. Stated that we need to pass the amendment in order for the rest of the motion to work.

Aliya – Argued that you cannot go light touch on racist legislation, and you cannot be a light touch racist. Stressed that as the University have a legal obligation to implement this policy, there is nothing that a student representative can do other than provide legitimacy to the process, and give the impression that students have been consulted. Urged that we need to take a much tougher stance, and encouraged council to listen to the students who will be affected by this policy. Responded to the question regarding divisional board reps, she states that they should not go to meetings and suggested that they send a statement explaining why.

Jack Matthews (University) – Raised that he has received a question asking what representatives have to do if a meeting that is not specifically about Prevent raises it at some point, or if it is just one item on the agenda. Asked if the motion would mean that they cannot attend at all, or if they would just have to leave for that section of the meeting.

Aliya – Answered that they do not want to take away from other things that representatives are working on, and that if Prevent does come up in these meetings, the representative will need to step outside until the discussion on Prevent is over, so they are not giving legitimacy to the conversation.

Vote on amendment:

For - 19

Against - 52

Abstain – 12

**Amendment fell.**

**Amendment received:**

In resolves 2, after "bodies", insert "directly".

In resolves 2, after "legally possible", insert "including to walk out of committees if Prevent is raised (and to walk back in when it is finished)."

**Proposed:** Nick Cooper (St John's)

**Seconded:** Cat Jones (Pembroke)

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Informed council that the sabbatical team sit on many committees going right up to the top to the governing body, and it is possible that discussions on Prevent may filter up, and neither the sabbs are the divisional Board reps can do their jobs, if they cannot sit on committees that may even possible mention Prevent. Explained that he wants to clarify that it is the boards that are set up directly to oversee the implementation of Prevent that representatives cannot sit on, rather than any of those that may even mention Prevent.

Aliya – Explained that she wants to make it clear that if a representative sits on a committee where Prevent comes up, the officer must walk out and refuse to cooperate at that point.

**Amendment accepted as friendly with no opposition.**

Move to vote.

No opposition.

For - 72

Against - 3

Abstain - 4

**Motion passed as amended.**

---

## **I. Any other business**

### **1. Student Written Submission (Appendix 3)**

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Explained that the Student Written Submission, a document that is being submitted for a review that is taking place in the University by the government. Added that this review checks the quality of education being provided, and it is very important that student views are included, and that this should be the views of all students, in particular liberation groups. Urged council to get in touch.

### **2. Disability, Sex and Relationships Workshop Report (Appendix 4)**

Lindsay Lee (Wadham) – Informed council that she has fulfilled a mandate which she gave herself to write a report on the Disability, Sex and Relationships Workshop. Reported that the event went really well, however there was a limited number of students, which arguably speaks about the stigma that still exists. Explained that she has used this report to lobby for the fact that OUSU needs to have an accessibility access fund, so that access adjustments are not a burden on event organisers.