

Council Minutes

3rd Week Trinity Term 2015

3rd Week Council took place at 5:30pm on Wednesday 13th May 2015, at St Hugh's College, Dickson Poon Lecture Theatre.

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. Presentation of the Budget from the OUSU President (appendices 1 & 2)
- g. Reports from the Executive Officers and the Divisional Board Representatives who wish to make reports
- h. Questions to members of the Executive and the Divisional Board Representatives
- i. Emergency motions
- j. Passage of motions without discussion
- k. Motions of No Confidence or censure
- l. Motions to amend Bye-Laws, General Regulations or Election Regulations
 1. Bye-Law Amendment
- m. Motions authorising expenditure
- n. Other motions
 2. Introduction of a Graduate LGBTQ Officer
 3. Divisional Board Elections
 4. Prelims Feedback
 5. Education Vision (2)
 6. Student Consultation Benchmark
 7. Government Consultation on Support for Postgraduate Study
- o. Any other business
 1. Council Survey
 2. Sabbatical Officer Remits

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

Student Parents and Carers Officer – Sam Shearn (Worcester) nominated.

No hust requested.

Sam – 39

RON – 3

Sam Shearn was elected.

Community Outreach and Charities Officer – Yoni Stone (Pembroke) nominated.

No hust requested.

Yoni – 39

RON – 3

Yoni Stone was elected.

Steering Committee – Wesley Nelson (Keble)

No hust requested.

Wesley – 39

RON – 3

Wesley Nelson was elected.

e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers

Jack Matthews (University) – Updated council that the International Students Festival is coming along nicely, adding that there was a slight error in his report, as the Festival would be taking place on Sunday of 8th week. Encouraged all to attend what was going to be a great celebration of international students in Oxford and all that they bring, not just to the University, but to the wider community. Added that he would also be working with the University to bring back the opportunity for International student societies to write to people who have an offer from the University, therefore allowing people to get in contact with relevant societies asking all the questions they might have before they arrive.

James Blythe (Brasenose) – Confirmed that Target Schools do not have to get DBS checks on everyone who gets shadowed, which is a great relief, as the scheme will be able to continue. Reported that he would be spending most of the next two weeks conducting reviews, and asked any earth scientists or PPEists to get in touch if they have any thoughts for him to feed in.

Ana Bradshaw (Wadham) – Reported that she has been doing lots of work around sexual violence and consent, but that the main thing she wanted to draw attention to was the upcoming Women’s Garden Party, taking place on Sunday of 5th week. Advertised that it is family friendly a great way to take some self-care, and that it will be running a number of sessions, including mindfulness and relaxation.

Ruth Meredith – Reported that she has been doing lots of work for RAG, who are launching a brand new event next term which has a lot of logistics to consider, as well as providing support to students who want to do things but don’t have quite the right resources. Added that she has been training and inducting new community wardens. Informed council that this term they would be running collections for linen for the Women’s refuge in Oxford, and asked if people were interested in being a pilot college for this to get in touch.

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Reported that it has arguably been the most boring two weeks of his life, stating that he has been writing the impact report, working on the budget, and dealing with a lot of governance. Flagged that on the following Monday, the University would be making a decision on whether it will divest from coal and tar sands which is very exciting. Added that there will be an event on Saturday at 4pm.

Chris Pike (Teddy Hall) – Stated that this week he has been working on ways to make OUSU events more accessible, starting with this event, including a checklist of ways to make events accessible, and an option to submit accessibility requirements and disability requests. Informed council of plans for an LGBTQ club night on Monday of 8th week to celebrate the re-invigoration of the campaign, as well as affiliation to Action for Trans* Health.

e. Presentation of the Budget from the OUSU President (appendices 1 & 2)

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Explained the process for the budget, which begins with everyone getting together and thinking on keys areas they want to work on and what they need money for, before he, along with Amelia (OUSU CEO) and the Finance Committee bring all these things together as a budget. Acknowledged that this year has been a bit tight, as OUSU are considering ways to help out the Hub. Explained that any feedback which is provided here will be given to the Trustee Board, and that it will be going to the University in about three weeks time. Noted two key elements in the budget to be aware of as increased budget for the Students Advice Service so they can start doing Saturday morning openings, and the return of Mi-Voice under democratic support costs, so that common rooms are able

to run elections through that system as they used to. Clarified that OUSU would continue to use the MSL system for statutory elections and referenda. Noted the apparent £50,000 loss, and explained that this is only present as OUSU are beginning to get down into their reserves as they had too many, and wanted to spend their money on doing things for students. Draw attention to appendix 1, which was produced by the Internal Affairs Committee, and covers the key elements of the budget.

Will Obeney (Regent's) – Questioned the reason behind the increase in the price of Freshers Fair stalls.

Louis – Answered that the increase in costs has been going up in a small way year on year, and this covers the inflation which we have not factored in for a number of years. Added that it is just also because we are not making enough money through our subsidiary company and this is a way to boost that. Noted that the main increase would not be coming from student stalls, but from commercial stalls, who pay much more than £40 for their stalls.

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

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

i. Emergency motions

j. Passage of motions without discussion

3. Divisional Board Elections

Council Notes:

1. That it decided in 7th week of Hilary to hold cross-campus ballots for divisional board representatives.
2. Only one nominee had been received by the deadline for nominations.

Council Resolves:

1. To postpone the divisional rep elections to 7th week Council.
2. To mandate the Vice-President (Access & Academic Affairs), Vice-President (Graduate) & Returning Officer to bring forward to Council later in term an appropriate means for electing divisional representatives, and to further promote the roles to ensure that candidates do come forward.

Proposed: James Blythe (Brasenose)

Seconded: Joe Smith (Somerville)

Motion passed without discussion.

5. Education Vision (2)

Council Notes:

1. That it mandated the creation of the Education Vision in Michaelmas.
2. Its discussion of the draft in 1st week of this term.

Council Resolves:

1. To approve and set as OUSU policy the Education Vision (attached as Appendix 5).
2. To mandate the Executive to work together under the leadership of the Vice-Presidents (Access & Academic Affairs) and (Graduates) to implement the Education Vision and its campaigning priorities.
3. To mandate the Vice-Presidents (Access & Academic Affairs) and (Graduates) to report annually on progress towards achieving the goals set out in the Vision.
4. To overturn the following policies: 'retention of the tutorial system'; 'National Student Survey'; 'undergraduate understanding of marking criteria', 'examinations feedback', 'clustering of small subjects', 'college fee', 'teaching opportunities for DPhils', 'postgraduate fee increases', as they are now superseded by the Education Vision.

Proposed: James Blythe (Brasenose)

Seconded: Jack Matthews (University)

Motion passed without discussion.

6. Student Consultation Benchmark

Council Notes:

1. That students have not always been fully, or appropriately consulted on changes or proposals within the University which may affect their Oxford experiences.
2. That Imperial College Union have implemented a successful Student Consultation Framework, setting out how students should be consulted.
3. That the Vice President Graduates and the Vice President Access and Academic Affairs have created the Student Consultation Benchmark (Appendix 6), as an Oxford specific guide to how the University, and OUSU, should consult students on policy changes and proposals. This has already been well received within the University.

Council Believes:

1. That students should be partners in shaping their Oxford experience.

Council Resolves:

1. To endorse the Student Consultation Benchmark, and mandate the Vice President Graduates, and Access and Academic Affairs to work with parties with the University to see it is used and implemented.

Proposed: Jack J. Matthews (University)

Seconded: James Blythe (Brasenose)

Motion passed without discussion.

7. Government Consultation on Support for Postgraduate Study

Council Notes:

1. At the Autumn Statement 2014, the Government announced its intention to introduce a new loan system for postgraduate taught Master's students.
2. At the Budget 2015, the Government announces its intention to review how to broaden support for postgraduate research students.
3. That the above two issues are being consulted upon by the Department for Business, Innovation & Skills, and that this Consultation closes on May 29th 2015.
4. That the University will be responding to the Consultation, and that any individual or group may also submit a response.

Council Believes:

1. That OUSU should submit a response to the Consultation, building on the Union's rich history of making independent responses to Government Consultations and Reviews.
2. That the University should continue to expand its provision of fully funded scholarships for all areas of graduate education.
3. That while the University continues to expand its scholarship provision, and until such provision can cover all Oxford Graduates, Government loans, repaid on a similar basis to undergraduate tuition fees, are welcome.
4. That more work needs to be done on the area of Postgraduate Access. In a world where more students need a graduate qualification to get the job they aspire too, OUSU should be working to make a Postgraduate degree as accessible as possible.
5. That access to funding for Postgraduate study should not be dependent on age, part-time/full-time status, or on the course type or subject area being studied.

Council Resolves:

1. Noting current OUSU Policy on Education Funding, and the beliefs set out above, to mandate the Vice President Graduates to respond to the Consultation, expressing support for postgraduate loans.
2. To mandate the Vice President Graduates, in the process of writing the response, to consult Common Room Presidents, Course Reps, and any other parties who express an interest.

Proposed: Jack J. Matthews (University)

Seconded: Marina Lambrakis (St John's)

Motion passed without discussion.

k. 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 minor drafting error in the Bye-Laws, which creates an ambiguity.

Council Resolves:

1. To give a Second 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: Chris Pike (St Edmund)

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Noted the numerous bye-law changes that had recently been made and noted that a small mistake was made that this motion rectifies.

Motion passed with no opposition.

m. Motions authorising expenditure

n. Other motions

2. Introduction of a Graduate LGBTQ Officer

Council Notes:

1. The graduate LGBTQ community of the university is currently represented in OUSU by the LGBTQ Officer, a position that is almost invariably filled by undergraduates.
2. The role of LGBTQ Officer has a wide range of responsibilities, including welfare, policy based campaigning and helping to run the LGBTQ Campaign.
3. According to the most recent survey, 22 college MCRs currently do not have the position of LGBTQ Representative, meaning that many LGBTQ graduate students are currently going unrepresented.
4. There is already a part-time Graduate Women's Officer in OUSU.

Council Believes:

1. The graduate LGBTQ community has needs which are specific to their graduate status, including but not limited to a different social and welfare culture and potential caring responsibilities, and most importantly the current lack of MCR LGBTQ Representatives.
2. The graduate LGBTQ community would be better represented and supported by a part-time officer who can focus directly on their specific needs and priorities.
3. The LGBTQ Officer has too wide a range of responsibilities to give the graduate LGBTQ community the representation it deserves.
4. It is appropriate that the role and the voting for it should only be open to graduate LGBTQ students.

Council Resolves:

1. To introduce a new Part Time Officer role, the Graduate LGBTQ Officer, and to make

all necessary amendments to both the general regulations and the election regulations, to be passed in 5th and 7th week Councils Trinity 2015.

2. To accept the remit set out in Appendix 3.

Proposed: Jenny Walker (Wadham)

Seconded: Zuleyka Shahin (Balliol)

Jenny Walker (Wadham) – Explained that her current position covers both undergraduates and graduates, but that this motion would propose a new graduate LGBTQ officer, meaning that the existing position would be undergraduate. Noted that one of the main reasons for doing this is that 22 MCRs do not have LGBTQ reps, and the support needed around getting these in could be a main priority of a new graduate role. Added that the social culture is different within graduate LGBTQ students, and that this officer would be free to focus on their particular needs.

Zuleyka Shahin (Balliol) – Introduced herself as OUSU's current Graduate Womens Officer, and explained that some of the work that is coming up, that could be done by the proposed officer, is currently being shared between her and Jenny's roles. Noted that she is not is not an LGBTQ rep, but by virtue of being a trans woman and very being very active in the LGBTQ community people tend to come forward to her, and as a result, she explained that she sometimes feels overwhelmed. Noted that a graduate should be doing this work specifically for the queer community.

Anna Bradshaw (Wadham) – Noted that in all other positions which have an additional graduate office, this officer provided extra provision for grads, and does not make the other officer undergraduate specific. Asked if the two positions would be seen as general and grad or undergrad and grad.

Jenny – Responded that she is only aware of one previous graduate running for her role, and although she is not suggesting that it is confined to undergrads, it is already effectively running as an undergraduate role.

Vicky Firth (Pembroke) – Asked if the proposers thought we would struggle to find people to run, considering there is already difficulty finding people to run for some positions.

Jenny – Responded that Zuleyka might be better placed to answer the question as she has more grad contacts, but stated that the worst that can happen is a vacant position. Added that it would still be a statement that we recognise that there are not enough grads in OUSU and we are trying to fix that. Suggested that if this does not work, people can contact her with other ideas on how we might better reach out to them.

Zuleyka – Answered that she believes that they would, as those MCRs who do have an LGBTQ rep are very active, and have been pushing and asking for OUSU to take heed of the LGBTQ community amongst graduates.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Asked if we would be excluding grads from the existing role.

Jenny - Responded that that would not be the case.

Kuba Stawiski (Merton) – Asked if it would become part of the role to try and make MCRs create the position of LGBTQ rep if they haven't got one already.

Jenny – Responded that although it depends on what they run with, she hoped this would be the case, however added that rather than make, it would be more encouragement.

Marin Lambrakis (St John's) – Asked if the fact that undergraduates have dominated the existing LGBTQ role is a problem with graduate engagement more broadly.

Jenny – Agreed that this is certainly a problem more broadly, and having spoken to a number of grads recently, finds that they tend to be more connected to their department than their college, so perhaps feel less of a need for college representation. Acknowledged that she doesn't know what is being done about this as a broader issue, but can see on the ground in her role that it would help LGBTQ grads.

Joe Smith – Asked who would be mandated to make the amendments referred to in resolves 1.

Louis – Answered that there is already a draft of these in preparation.

Eden – Stated that she appreciated the work being done by both proposers, but asked how a broader overview of part-time executive positions would fit in with this. Noted the difference between the set up of women's officers, which is a graduate officer and an officer who looks after a campaign, another than what is proposed here for LGBTQ officers. Suggested that adding another officer in ad hoc is not necessarily the best thing to do, and that perhaps we need a bigger look at how graduates fit in with our liberation work.

James Blythe (Brasenose) – Explained that he had similar reservations regarding the need for an overall review of the executive, particularly as we currently have more that can all fit in any one room of OUSU at the same time. Noted that he would consequently oppose from time to time additions to the executive, and would rather support a review that looked at all the roles and how they fit together. Added that he would be prepared to go back on that if there was an urgent need, but he is not convinced that this is currently the case.

Marina – Explained that she is unsure where she stands on this but that she does have some concerns. Noted that she is uncomfortable with this forum as we are mostly undergrads and not everyone here defines as LGBTQ. Reported that when discussing this, she has received mixed reviews. Echoed James's issues about the executive, which already has lots of different people who it is difficult to keep up with, adding that the graduate roles are often the ones which remain unfilled. Added that one person raised that creating a grad LGBTQ officer gives the impression of sectioning them off and putting them in a corner.

Jack Matthews (University) – Explained that he was not going to be giving any comments of his own, but instead reading a statement sent to him earlier by two graduate students, Catherine Stag (Green Templeton) and Timothy Bourns (St John's):

'We are the graduate representatives of the Universities LGBTQ society and we strongly oppose this motion to create an OUSU grad LGBTQ officer. While the graduate LGBTQ community does have specific needs and priorities, they are already well served by the LGBTQ society graduate reps. Our role is nearly identical to the one being proposed today, making this position redundant. Our role is also often very difficult to fill, suggesting that were this new

position to be created, it is unlikely that there would be sufficient interest to fill it. We work hard to provide regular social events for the graduate LGBTQ community throughout the year and are also well known throughout the graduate community for being available to help with welfare concerns. Our events are well attended and our welfare role is well respected. The creation of this new position threatens to undermine the important role in LGBTQ society of graduate representatives, within our community. One of us, Catherine, has served as OUSU LGBTQ officer in the past and we thus feel well placed to say that this graduate position is unnecessary. The current position is open to both grads and undergrads and is perfectly capable of serving both communities as the disabled officer and the BME officer also does. We are disappointed that our advice to not create this role was disregarded, and we would urge council to vote against this position, as we strongly believe it to be both unnecessary and potentially detrimental to our community.'

Anna – Offered a few things about her experiences of working with three successive graduate women's officers, a role that we do not have a problem filling, partly due to a very active feminist and women's community within Oxford, and actively seeking women's involvement means that there are lots of links which exist pre-elections. Added that the role has brought some great things to OUSU, such as the Womcam grad rep place. Continued that in the case of women it is potentially easier to see the clear differences faced by graduates, however the worry that there is not work to be done, or a concern that it will not be filled, are not really the reasons to have problems with the creation of any graduate liberation place.

Kristina Carney (Hertford) – Informed council of her surprise at some of the comments, considering that the proposers themselves have explained that they are overwhelmed with the amount of work that they have, so the suggestion that all is under control is clearly not true. Added that to not create a position because someone might not run would be unheard of to her, as at the very least no-one fills the role and you go from there.

Chris Pike (St Edmund) – Reported that he had issues with this motion to start with as well, however as he is not a graduate, he would not be claiming any experience on the matter. Stated that he wanted to defend Jenny against a number of the comments made, as she has been considering this idea for weeks and weeks, and has consulted with so many graduate LGBTQ people in deciding whether to bring this motion, as well as consulting with the grad officers in the LGBTQ society, as well as enormous numbers of LGBTQ students across graduate colleges with the help of Zuleyka. Noted that he understood the arguments against the officer, but that it is important to not decide against a role just because it will not be filled for a while. Concluded that it is absolutely the case that there are many graduate LGBTQ people across the University that would value this role. Reminded everyone that we are here as representatives, not as individuals, and all of us represent people who are LGBTQ, so not defining as such should not prevent you from voting, however those who represent JCRs do not represent graduates and therefore are probably not best placed to vote on a motion specifically for graduates.

Move to vote.

Opposed.

Matthew Collyer (New) – Stated that we have heard a number of passionate speeches on either side of the debate and he doubted that we will get a huge amount more.

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Stated that his mind is not made up and he wanted to hear what other people had to say.

Vote on move to vote:

For – 16

Against – 26

Vote fell – debate continued.

Henry Holmes (Wadham) – Introduced themselves as current chair of the LGBTQ campaign, and stated that talking about what the grad society people said is very confusing, as a while ago the society said that they didn't want to be political in any way, which is where the campaign is different. Acknowledged if this is no longer the case, there will be some overlap, but that is no reason to have no representation for graduates on our campaign. Asked if part of the role would be to help with the campaign.

Jenny – Confirmed that she thought it would.

Benji Woolf (Christ Church) – Asked if any quantitative research had been done on whether the grads want the extra rep or not, as both sides seem to have heard conflicting opinions.

Jenny - Replied that it had not.

Kuba – Stated that as a graduate student, he is aware of the problem of getting grads involved in OUSU, and it is obviously a difficult decision to decision if to deal with this through the creation of positions. Noted that his own MCR at Merton does not have nay liberation officers, and many of his friends on joining the MCR found it very difficult to connect with any societies or groups around the University, and this position would be helpful in assisting with that.

Tom Barringer (St Hugh's) – Suggested a count of people in the room who represent MCR members.

A straw poll showed that only 11 people in the room represented solely undergraduate students, which left 30 people who represented graduate students as part of their role.

Marina – Asked if LGBTQ campaign had a grad rep in the way that Womcam do.

Jenny – Confirmed that there is going to be.

Jenny – Stated that she finds the comment from the grad reps very surprising as she has been emailing them about the issue for several weeks. Added that she dis not make this decision alone, as an undergraduate student, but with the consultation from many graduate LGBTQ students who support this idea. Stated that she does not know how provisional a general review of the executive is, and that she is not willing to factor that into her proposal when there is no time scale or suggestion that it will happen soon. Accepted that this is a unusual format to pass this motion in, however she was unsure where else she can bring it to pass it. Concluded that there is so much work she and Zuleyka have the potential to do, and that it is never going to be the case that this person would not have to do enough to do.

Jacob Page (St Catherine's) – Explained that he is a 4th year chemist, so does not have a degree but in terms of his department is very much treated like a graduate. Stated that from a lot of the arguments he has heard, he is not convinced that this is something that cannot be addressed by increased graduate participation in OUSU, as he is unsure what specific issues need to be addressed that cannot be done by the existing LGBTQ role.

Zuleyka – Acknowledged that they have not done any quantitative research, and in her role, a lot of what she does is very grassroots, with face to face discussions with individual students, and that many of these discussions are outside of her remit and could be dealt with by a graduate LGBTQ officer. Concluded that she is not in OUSU so that she can be part of bureaucratic meetings, but so she can do grassroots work within her community, and this would provide someone doing the same type of work specifically for LGBTQ individuals.

Kristina – Argued that the idea that we have to wait until ten, twenty people are waiting for a representative is very irresponsible, and that graduate engagement can start with showing people that they have those contacts.

Move to vote.

No opposition.

Jenny – Urged people not to vote based on room size, or no one running, as these are not valid reasons. Noted that listening to Zuleyka, there is clearly a lot of need for this, and she wanted to reach out to graduates, concluding that having people on the ground doing this work is the most important thing.

Vote:

For – 27

Against – 4

Abstain – 17

Motion passed.

4. Prelims Feedback

Council Notes:

1. That it mandated the Vice-President (Access & Academic Affairs) to begin a campaign on prelims feedback.
2. That after meetings of University committees in Hilary Term, a full consultation has been launched with all colleges and departments, and formally with OUSU.
3. That Appendix 4, OUSU's potential response, was considered, redrafted and then endorsed by the Executive Committee at its 2nd week meeting.

Council Believes:

1. That the response from most departments and colleges is likely to be negative, and so now is the time to begin preparing alternative means of achieving the goal of enhanced feedback on prelims.

Council Resolves:

1. To approve Appendix 4 as OUSU's response to the consultation.
2. To mandate the Vice-President (Access & Academic Affairs) to begin preparing resources for students to launch Data Protection Act requests for their own academic results.

Proposed: Jack Hampton (St Catherine's)

Seconded: Christopher Casson (St Catherine's)

Jack Hampton (St Catherine's) – Speaking to re-affirm an earlier commitment when council discussed the need for prelims feedback. Reported that this has since been to Education Committee, and has been considered by various departments and bodies across the University, and that the response had been overwhelmingly negative, which is not unexpected, on the basis that it would detract from tutor's time spent doing research, which is what brings in money and prestige to the University. Explained that this motion aims to trigger the second part of the earlier motion, to distribute information on Freedom of Information requests to students to make it an easier and less confusing process. Explained that they think this needs to be done as it will out pressure of the University if they see a lot more requests for exam papers to be returned, will demonstrate a need, and will help new freshers, as even if this will not change in time to help us, we should assist others working towards this. Added that it would increase the accountability of tutors.

Ellie Miles-Smith (St John's) – Asked how many students have made FOI requests and how many have been successful.

Jack – Answered that he didn't know but that James Blythe has informed him that a lot of the requests are unsuccessful as students don't understand the process, make errors in their applications or apply too late.

Hossein Sharafi (Keble) – Asked how long the University currently hold prelim papers for.

James Blythe (Brasenose) – Answered that they would need to hold them long enough for students to appeal, which would be approximately one month.

Benji Woolf (Christ Church) – Stated that he took his prelims last term and asked of there was any chance of retrieving them.

Jack - Answered that they would have already been destroyed by the University.

Ellie - Asked if this would apply to resits of prelims.

Jack – Answered that this is just the distribution of information of Freedom of Information requests so could be used to request this.

St Hugh's student – Asked how likely it is that an FOI will be successful.

Jack – Responded that providing it is filled in correctly and on time, the University will have to return the papers.

Motion passed with no opposition.

o. Any other business

1. Council Survey (Appendix 7)

Nick Cooper (St John's) - Flagged that the results of the survey are detailed in appendix 7 and are available online. Urged people to have a read of it.

2. Sabbatical Officer Remits (Appendix 8)

Jack Matthews (University) – Reported that over Easter we did a consultation on the issues that students want their student union to be dealing with and the division of labour between those that they think are political and should be dealt with by elected representatives, and those that should be dealt with by members of staff. Stated that this had been covered in a four page document which he urged people to read. Stated that it would now be discussed further by the Executive and the Trustee Board, as well as in very preliminary discussion with the University. Reminded council that nothing would happen without their approval, and that the process is still in the very early stages.

Hossein Sharafi (Keble) – Asked if there could be signing on route to meetings.

Nick – Replied that they would put some posters up in future.