

3rd Week Trinity 2017 *Minutes*

TIME: 5:30pm

DATE: 10th May

LOCATION: Nazrin Shah Lecture Theatre, Worcester College

We aim to make Council as accessible as possible, and ensure that it is always in accessible venues. However, if there are any accessibility requirements that we are not meeting for yourself or others, please contact:

OUSU's Democratic Support Officer, Josh O'Connor:

01865 611831 | dso@ousu.ox.ac.uk

a. Minutes of the previous meeting

b. Matters arising from the minutes

c. Elections in council

d. Reports from and questions to the Sabbatical Trustees, Executive Officers, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (Raise and Give)

e. Items for resolution

1. Standing in solidarity with CEU (The Central European University)
2. Sanctuary Campus
3. Bye-Law and Regulations changes

Below the Line

4. Revision to the STUDENTSplus Constitution

f. Items for debate

g. Any other business

Please Note:

OUSU's team will be filming elements of Council as part of a new marketing and communication plan to promote OUSU Council. If you are not happy to be filmed or would like to remain out of the footage, please contact the Democratic Support Officer.

Beth Currie, VP CC: Before we start just a reminder that the deadline to register to vote in the general election is 22nd May. We have organized two hustings for the Oxford East and West candidates. 22nd May we have the Oxford West husting at StHugh's and on the 5th June, we'll have the Oxford East husting at the Sheldonian Theatre. Also, OUSU's intercollege voter registration competition begins today.

a. Minutes of the previous meeting No issues

b. Matters arising from the minutes No matters arising

c. Elections in Council

Beth Currie, Chair: We will do hustings for both positions.

Alex Curtis, St Catz College: I'm Alex, I am a student trustee at OUSU. I'm running for this position because frankly it's been left open for too long. We currently have a By-Election going for VP Grad, we have Council and we have no actual chair and in the absence of the chair it is the returning officer's responsibility to act as acting chair. I want to do this and do my bit to help out. I have experience in governing and running elections. I'd like to use these skills towards helping out Council out.

Josh O'Connor, Returning Officer: Are there any questions for Alex? None seen. We'll move on the hustings for Deputy Returning Officer.

James Brennan, St Peter's College: I'm James, a first year at St Peter's. I know Alex quite well so I can keep an eye on him better than most. It is important that we have returning officers and someone to keep an eye on the returning officer obviously. I'm not really involved with OUSU at all which is probably an advantage. I don't really know any of you. So, I'll make sure the election for VP Grads goes smoothly.

Josh O'Connor, Returning Officer: Does anyone have any questions for James? None seen. (josh explains how the voting works)

RESULTS: Alex 31, RON 4; James 34, RON 1

Chair of Council - to chair meetings of OUSU Council (and Council's Steering Committee) for Trinity Term 2017.

Returning Officer - oversees elections and vote-counting in Council, and assists with any other elections or referendums. To serve for Trinity Term 2017.

Deputy Returning Officer - Assists the Returning Officer in overseeing elections and vote-counting in Council, and assists with any other elections or referendums. To serve for Trinity Term 2017.

Steering Committee (x2) - Steering Committee is responsible for compiling the agenda for Council, and referring motions submitted to Council to other committees for preliminary discussions as and when needed. To serve for Michaelmas Term 2016.

d. Reports from and questions to the Sabbatical Officers, Executive Officers, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (Raise and Give)

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grads: I did not submit a report this week and it was late. That is for various reasons however I've been run off my feet so I am going to be a bit longer with you now and then also I'll be putting up my report tomorrow. So basically, since last Council I've been busy mostly with the Grad suspension focus groups and I've been doing some analysis as well writing a report about graduates who are suspended to take this to the University's working group. Which I'd like to thank those students taking part in those focus groups it been pretty helpful. Apart from that I've had some really helpful meetings to progress the work that Beth and I are doing on graduate employment. We met with the Vice Chancellor who had some really good ideas about how to take that forward and try to get the university to rethink how they work with grads. Last night we had hustings for my

successor. If she is elected, we shall see. That was really great. That was at Somerville. We live tweeted it so you can see all the questions which were put to her last night. Her name is Marianne Melsen, she is a masters student in higher education. She has some really interesting ideas. I higher encourage you to have a look at her manifesto and see what you think of it. I think she is also quite keen to hear from students quite generally. There were some challenging questions put to her. You can see those on the twitter. The elections are next week Tuesday to Thursday. We'll be announcing the results on Thursday evening. I did an SAS pop up to promote the by-election. That's the bulk of what I've been working on.

Tomorrow is teaching awards which is really exciting. A lot of work has gone into it. Thank you so much to everyone who was nominated. We had 895 nominations which is the most we've ever had.

Jack Hampton, President: Hi Council, over the last couple of week I've been very busy and not in the office that much because I've been out at NUS conference and IT innovation and various other things. I just wanted to pull two bits of out what a lot of the organization has been doing for the last few weeks which has been very events focused. We had Springtide; our first attempt at a real community festival which was good and had a footfall of about 2000 people. Which is the highest engaging event that OUSU has done face to face in a very long time. The other big event which I was pushing last week was Rouge, our club night at Plush. We managed to sell that out as well. Another club night at capacity when we've only just started to move into this area is great. That night will be running next Thursday. The one thing I wanted to mention about NUS conference, apart from the fact it was absolutely exhausting, is how proud I am of our fantastic delegates. Conference is a difficult experience with people pestering you to vote this way or that and so much going on but our delegates were engaged and did what you elected them to do. I'd like to draw your attention to two motions which passed. One was a motion around student welfare, which is something very close to my heart, we managed to get NUS to commit to producing a template welfare survey for every single SU in this country. We also got a motion which mean NUS must lobby on specific NHS issues.

Sandy Downs, VP WEO: Hi Council, you can check my twitter for updates on what I've been doing. Thoughtless moments are still happening; Wednesday walks with dogs, Monday meditation and this Tuesday we have a free outdoor cinema which you can vote online to choose the film for. I've been looking at the impact of Prevent in Oxford. Next week there is a BME subgroup please come along.

Eden Bailey, VP AccAff: Hi Council, my report was also submitted late, I apologise for that, it should be online now. The two main things which have taken up the last two weeks have been a department review with the department of zoology and plant sciences. That took up almost every single day last week. This was a massive amount of work stretching across a number of student group and should really be beneficial to a lot of students. Especially considering all those affected by the closure of the Tinbergen Building. The other main thing which I've been working on is heading up the new OUSU Campaign Class Act that a lot of you supported last time Council met. We have had an astonishing response with nearly 200 people signing up for the mailing list 500 likes on the Facebook Page within a week 60 nominations for executive positions and over 100 people voting in those elections. This amount of involvement with an OUSU Campaign is unprecedented. Thank you so much for everyone who has gotten involved in that. I was questioning whether setting up this campaign was the right thing but I now have no doubts it was exactly what students here wanted.

Beth Currie, Chair: Any questions?

Tom Barringer, StHugh's: Where is Orla?

Eden Bailey, VP AccAff: Orla is in bed unwell unfortunately. You can view Orla's report to Council online.

Beth Currie, Chair: Now I'd like to invite the NUS delegates to report on NUS conference and answer questions.

Aliya Yule, Wadham College: NUS conference was very busy. I ran for the executive committee of NUS and was elected. There was a lot of debate over things which we didn't think we were meant to be debating.

Jack Hampton, President: I'll add that this conference had a major democracy review on the agenda which was the result of 5 years' worth of work. There were questions about NUS's effectiveness here at Oxford and now this democracy review at NUS has passed it should be changing in a big way. My personal opinion is that this change is a good thing.

Aliya Yule, Wadham College: There was a democracy review but unlike Jack I don't think it was a debate that happens and was instead was pushed through. There weren't arguments put through for most of the motion's content. One of the things was to abolish the NEC which completely removes accountability from the sabbatical officers. Conference is now the only time to hold the officers to account

which isn't good. A lot of work went into it and it was a shame it went through the way it did.

Jack Hampton, President: I disagree, that is democracy.

Ellie MacDonald, St Hilda's College: I was disappointed by the consideration/representation of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the motions which were heard at conference.

Lucasta Bath, Hertford College: The democracy motion was incredibly long with 16 or 17 amendments to it and it was in the final zone to be discussed. Realistically the only way we would have finished it is if we started it on day one. But aside from the fact that it was good, we all followed our mandates and I was happy with the elections of the new VPs and President.

Niamh White, Keble College: There were some really exciting motions which I was happy to support (the rest was inaudible) There were motion on student mental health. In terms of the democracy review there wasn't really enough time left to do it properly. Thank you to all the other delegates.

Adam Hilsenrath, LMH: Overall I was quite happy with the results of most of the elections. (inaudible)

Beth Currie, Chair: Any questions for the NUS Delegates?

Guo Sheng Liu, Lincoln College: With the new president, what changes should we expect in NUS?

Adam Hilsenrath, LMH: There wasn't really a stand out candidate for president. Shakira is not in a faction but she did stand in a slate. I wrote in my manifesto that I wouldn't vote for Malia due to disagreeing with her comments in the past. I therefore voted for Shakira as voting for Tom would increase the chance of Malia winning. I hope Shakira will unify politics in NUS.

Niamh White, Keble College: I met Malia. I said I'd vote the way I felt was right when I was at conference and I did. I'm impressed with Shakira's work as a VP and she has great ideas. It's great there is another woman of colour as president of NUS. I felt that on the whole Malia's policies better represented the student movement and she had good knowledge to implement those ideas. I voted for Malia because she was the stronger candidate in my opinion. I am hopeful for what Shakira is going to do.

Lucasta Bath, Hertford College: I thought Shakira was an excellent candidate and I was really pleased to vote for her. Part of my mandate was to vote against Malia. I think Shakira will be a unifying candidate and she will also restore the reputation of the NUS. She hasn't come into the job with any kind of agenda, she's got loads of experience, it's long been said there isn't enough representation of FE students in NUS and she is the former FE VP.

Ellie Macdonald, St Hilda's College: I voted for Malia because I had the privilege of meeting her at Women's Conference and I found her very position of putting liberation politics at the heart of the student movement appealed to me. I also put Shakira as second because I realized she was the more centralised candidate. She brings a lot in terms of FE.

???: What's FE?

Ellie Macdonald, St Hilda's College: Further Education.

Jack Hampton, President: I voted RON. I wasn't impressed by any of the candidates. I spoke to all of the candidates before and at conference asking them all the same kinds of questions around the issues I've found as a students' union president. About supporting me as an officer to support you guys. I don't feel hugely supported by NUS over the last year. Which is why I didn't support the incumbent; I was wholly unimpressed with every answer Shakira gave me. I hope she is better than my impression of her. I did try very hard to talk to all the candidates. The speeches were amazing but I wanted to base my vote on more than that.

Aliya Yule, Wadham College: I met Shakira two years ago she was really lovely and about to run for VP FE. I think it is disingenuous to say Shakira is non-factional and the unity candidate when she was very obviously running on a slate and according to a lot of Muslim FE students I spoke to viewed it as a betrayal of their trust that Shakira didn't do any work on Preventing Prevent. The FE zone felt let down by Shakira. She didn't mobilise for a party before an NUS event for example. She did no organizing for it but left it to Malia to organize. The event was expensive which was a barrier to entry for FE students. Shakira has good ideas, is a brilliant speaker but in term of what I think Shakira is going to do over the next year as president; I don't think very much. I also don't think NUS will stop being divisive.

Beth Currie, Chair: In the interests of time please keep future answer to 20seconds

Sam Banks, Merton College: Asking for a point of information. In the democracy

review it talks about holding an extraordinary conference. If it passed will there be an extraordinary conference and who will be representing OUSU at it?

Jack Hampton, President: I think it was left ambiguous whether it would be called or not. I don't think that particular amendment was passed as it wasn't one of the ones which was talked about. But the main motion left it open as a possibility.

Eden Bailey, VP AccAff: I think it's something which could be called but would require a procedural type thing with X number of SUs democratically passing policy in support of sending it to ordinary conference. That's my understanding.

Aliya Yule, Wadham College: It takes 25 SUs to call one and then the event will be about timing whether it will be called within this year but we have 7 weeks so that is unlikely.

Jack Hampton, President: if it is within my term it will be me who goes. If it is not, then it will be my successor.

Beth Currie, chair: Any more questions? Seeing none. We now have the results from the elections in Council. For the role of returning officer; Alex got 31 votes and RON got 3, for the role of Deputy Returning Officer; James got 34 votes and RON got 1. Therefore, both candidates are elected. At this point I'd like to hand over to Alex as chair.

Alex Curtis, chair: Thank you, moving on with the agenda to item one. Does anyone have any points to raise in regards to motion one? Some seen, motion two? Some seen, motion three? Some seen. Does anyone want to bring an item above the line? None seen. Speech in proposition for motion one?

e. Items for Resolution

1. Standing in solidarity with CEU (The Central European University)

Council Notes:

1. That the Central European University is a private university founded and financed by George Soros. It is seen as one of the most prestigious universities in Central Europe for social sciences and humanities.
2. That on April 4, 2017, a piece of legislation was adopted by the Hungarian Parliament amending the National Higher Education Act that would, if implemented, force the Central European University in Budapest to close.
3. That the Rector of the university Michael Ignatieff is noted as saying that the proposed law "would make it impossible for CEU to continue its operations as an institution of higher education in Hungary authorized

to grant degrees accredited in both Hungary and the United States. As we see it, this is legislation targeted at one institution and one institution only. It is discriminatory. It strikes at the heart of what we have been doing at CEU for over two decades. We are in full conformity with Hungarian law and have been for more than two decades.”

4. That protests erupted in Hungary in support of the university. Many see this initiative of Viktor Orbán’s government as an affront to academic freedom and as a step designed to silence opposition voices.
5. That many universities, faculties and colleges (including St Hugh’s College) have expressed their solidarity with CEU.
6. That the European Commission concluded the law is not compatible with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and took legal action against Hungary, announcing infringement proceedings [Hungarian government has one month to respond (by May 27)]: “...the law is not compatible with the fundamental international market freedoms, notably the freedom to provide services and the freedom of establishment but also with the right of academic freedom, the right to education and the freedom to conduct a business as provided by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, as well as with the Union’s legal obligations under international trade law.”

Council Believes:

1. That this move by the Hungarian government constitutes an attack on the values of academic freedom, democracy, and open society.
2. That by this act, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán and his party FIDESZ have proved themselves to be a danger to Hungarian democracy.
3. That the closure of the CEU should be prevented.

Council Resolves:

1. That the following proclamation be published:

‘We, the Student Union of Oxford University, believe in the values of free academic endeavour, of free exchange of ideas, and of a democratic and open society. We are strongly committed to defending them. We condemn the actions taken against the Central European University by the Prime Minister of Hungary Viktor Orbán and his government. We believe that this constitutes an affront to the values we stand for.

We voice our concerns about the authoritative direction that, through enacting this legislation, the current Hungarian government is heading.

Finally, we express solidarity with the students and faculty members of the Central European University. We appeal to the conscience of the members of the Hungarian National Assembly and of the Hungarian government to reconsider this legislation. We urge them to respect the values of academic freedom and of a democratic and open society.

#WeStandWithCEU’

2. That OUSU writes a signed letter to the Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán and another letter to the Hungarian President Dr. Janos Ader expressing our solidarity with CEU and our concerns about its closure in accordance with the spirit of this motion and the above proclamation.
3. To write an additional letter to the Foreign Secretary detailing these concerns.

Proposed: Curtis Crowley, St Hugh's College

Seconded: Ana Pavlova, St Hugh's College

Curtis Crowley, St Hugh's College: The motion I've brought to you today was passed at St Hugh's JCR meeting. It concerns the Central European University which you may know. It's been the center of significant controversy in Hungary where the government has passed legislation which would effectively target this one university and force it to close and this policy designed to express OUSU's concerns with this legislation and to stand in solidarity with the students and faculty of this university. From the European Commission; "The law is not compatible with market freedoms". There are points from the Human Rights Watch stating that "the law endangers academic freedom". There are quotes from other organisations in the motion. Countless universities across the world have stood in solidarity and I think it's time Oxford joins them. To prove this a concern to students at Oxford I refer you to the letters of the Vice-Chancellors of several colleges including Pembroke and St Anthony's. Many faculties all expressing great concerns and speaking up in protection of academic freedom. It is our responsibility to speak up and stand in solidarity on this issue.

Alex Curtis, Chair: Thank you very much. Any short factual questions?

Aliya Yule, Wadham College: Do you know what basis the legislation is going to close the university down based on that it's a foreign university, a private university or what basis is it affective?

Curtis Crowley, St Hugh's College: It's complicated but to be clear the university is acting completely legally so there is no question about that. It depends on how cynical you want to be but it is known that the Hungarian PM doesn't approve of the founder of the university George Soros whose pretty liberal. There are basically lots of politically motivated reasons to close this one university and the government is referring to this legislation as "CEU" which identifies it is targeting this one university.

Alex Curtis, Chair: Any more factual questions? Any opposition to the motion?

Tom Barringer, St Hugh's College: I'd like to make an amendment. There is one word which stands out which is 'proclamation' which means, at the JCR level, we'd try to get an article put in the Cherwell but that's it. We can probably do a bit better at OUSU's level so I'd like to add resolves 3.

Curtis Crowley, St Hugh's College: Taken as friendly

Alex Curtis, Chair: Motion has now been amended. Any speeches in opposition?

Motion passes. Proposer for next motion please?

2. Sanctuary Campus

Council Notes:

1. That there has been a rise in racist, xenophobic and Islamophobic attacks since Brexit and the election of Donald Trump
2. That international students and migrant workers are facing uncertain times with increasing deportations and difficulties regarding visas and immigration status
3. That students of colour and Muslim students are suffering due to the invasive Islamophobic PREVENT duty
4. That many members of the student body have been involved in protests about Donald Trump's "Muslim ban" in recognition of the dangers of racism, xenophobia and Islamophobia for people in the UK and abroad
5. That some universities in the US have adopted a "sanctuary campus" approach, which involves practical support to stop racist government policy from harming the welfare of international students, students of colour and migrant workers, for instance by resisting deportation officials

Council Believes:

1. That we must stand in solidarity with students of colour, international students, Muslim students, and all imigrants and asylum seekers in oxford
2. That we must oppose the intrusive monitoring policies which the government imposes on international students
3. That the PREVENT duty is a breach of human rights and must be opposed within our universities
4. That although it is not always possible to stop the effects of racist government policy on campus, we must try and minimise the impact of these policies on student welfare
5. That migrant workers are a vital part of our institution and their rights must be safeguarded

Council Resolves:

1. To support the Sanctuary Campus campaign, led by Oxford Migrant Solidarity along with other local and university campaign groups
2. To mandate the relevant sabbatical officer to organise the speak outs mentioned in point 2 of the pledge
3. To mandate the relevant sabbatical officer to liaise with the student advice service about sufficient training to support international students
4. To mandate the relevant sabbatical officer to create a document about the importance of refusing to pass on information to the home office about international students and to circulate this to academics
5. To mandate the sabbatical team to disseminate information about international students' rights through suitable and effective means.
6. To mandate relevant sabbatical officer to make a document explaining all their rights in an accessible way, including sources of help such as free legal advice which is provided by some law students at the

University of Oxford and Oxford Brookes

7. To mandate the **relevant sabbatical officer** and Oxford's NUS reps to vote in line with pledge point 5 at NUS conference
8. To mandate the Living Wage campaign to liaise with union reps and migrant workers to work towards providing the support mentioned in pledge point 9
9. To sign up to the following pledge, one suggested by Movement For Justice By Any Means Necessary as part of their national Sanctuary Campus campaign
10. To mandate OUSU to write to all heads of college urging them to protect all migrant staff in the wake of Brexit.
11. The mandate the Vice-President Charities and Committee to take the lead on ensuring the resolves of the motion are acted upon.

Proposed: Lily MacTaggart, Hertford College

Seconded: Lilith Newton, Balliol College

Lily MacTaggart, Hertford College: (Hard to hear in recording but introduces the motion)

Alex Curtis, Chair: Short factual questions?

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grads: The pledge wasn't in the agenda that I've seen. I don't know if it was circulated but didn't make it on the agenda? Can you summarise what's in it?

Lily MacTaggart, Hertford College: It has 10 different points in it. I thought I put it in but it is about securing the education of international students and protecting migrant workers,

Alex Curtis, Chair: Any more factual questions?

Ava Scott, Hertford College: Is this the same pledge which was brought to Hertford last term?

Lily MacTaggart, Hertford college: It's been edited as the JCR comments said it was too extreme. There was a part which stated supporting international students by any means necessary and I think students were concerned what that could mean. So it was changed to means available to us such as.... We also changed the pledge which encouraged the blocking of immigration enforcement officers to a lack of penalising those who block them.

Ava Scott, Hertford College: I would suggest that Council should see the pledge before they vote on this motion.

Aliya Yule, Wadham College: Amend to add believes 1 and resolves 10

Lily MacTaggart, Hertford College: Taken as friendly

Eden Bailey, VP AccAff: Change any mention of a specific sabb to appropriate sabb. Add resolves 11. Change resolves 5.

Lily MacTaggart, Hertford College: I'm not sure about taking the international student 101 workshop out.

Eden Bailey, VP Accff: There is currently a fight in each college to get the different liberation 101 workshops in every college fresher's week and the colleges are more likely to say no to all of them than yes to all of them. Therefore, we are looking at a whole liberation 101 workshop or a similar approach which is more likely to be accepted.

Lily MacTaggart, Hertford College: Accepted amendment.

Alex Curtis, Chair: Any opposition to the motion in amended form?

Tom Barringer, St Hugh's College: I've just tweeted the pledge using the hashtag ousucouncil so you can find it there.

Alex Curtis, chair: Speeches in opposition please?

Sam Banks, Merton College: there are some point which need clarification. What does block attempts to implement prevent strategy in the pledge? Also, point 9 which involves the university not cooperating with the Home Office.

Lily MacTaggart, Hertford College: I haven't got it in front of me but yes that is probably what it said.

???: It now says we will support those who do that so it's not that we will do that.

Sam Banks, Merton College: I think making point 7 about blocking prevent is not currently in OUSU policy. I also have concerns about supporting of actively going against home office officials.

Aliya Yule, Wadham College: OUSU boycotts training welfare officers in prevent as the government would like us to. We are allowed to currently do that. But what we don't do is boycott anything to do with prevent. I don't think this motion is calling for us to do that either.

Jack Hampton, President: Point of information part of the pledge involves the support of direct illegal action us as trustees of the organisation we cannot condone it.

Alex Curtis, chair: thank you for that contribution, any other comments?

Ava Scott, Hertford College: Procedural motion to delay until next OUSU council

Alex Curtis, chair: Any opposition? None seen the amended motion will be brought to the next OUSU Council.

3. Bye-Law and Regulations changes

Council Notes:

1. The Elections are one of the most important democratic events OUSU does
2. Ensuring the Elections are run in a free and proper manner is a legal obligation
3. The budget advisory group has not been used in years

Council Believes:

1. That Junior Tribunal is an ineffective unnecessarily logistically difficult method of having an external appeals body
2. That a student taking on the role of Returning Officer is a large amount of work and responsibility
3. That if the student Returning Officer wanted they could compromise the legitimacy of the Election which is of significant risk for OUSU
4. That the role of Deputy Returning Officer does not offer enough
5. That all the students Returning Officer, Deputy Returning Officer and Sabbatical Trustees have votes in the Elections and therefore have an interest in its outcome and aren't impartial.
6. The current regulations do not allocate decision making powers in a consistent manner
7. The budget advisory group should be removed from the governance

Council Resolves:

1. Approve the new Bye-Laws and Regulations

Proposed: Jack Hampton, OUSU

Seconded: Sandy Downs: OUSU

Jack Hampton, OUSU: brought presentation because governance changes are complicated, and that they had substantial implications so must not be brushed 'under the carpet', nor hidden under jargon, first part compares what exists and the proposed changes; Elections committee will change - currently student RO, DRO + sabs and DSO. RO and DRO moved to staff positions, removes student trustees, adds student elected members. Who the DRO and RO are change. No longer student elected roles, as RO has incredible workload, so very difficult as a student opportunity, and there's a great deal of risk involved. All that can be done is remove them from the position, however that's what happens when election ends anyway. Staff members have their job on the line. It's an operations thing, and so should be done by staff.

Junior tribunal atm is the second highest position of appeal if one's unhappy with an RO or elections committee - made up of former RO, DRO's and Sabbs - it is very hard for this to be convened. Procedurally very difficult, and it's not the

sector norm – most other SUs do it differently. People who aren't part of the Uni do it, and that's what will be proposed.

Accountability – now there's a majority of students who sit on the elections committee (three students out of five members). Deputy returning and returning officer can be held to account via staff procedures, rather than student procedures. Junior tribunal can still be overruled by university.

So why?

Junior tribunal already explained The DRO job is currently just to be the RO if the RO is ill, which isn't a great opportunity. With returning officers, there is too much risk. Much harder than chair of council, and only once chance to get it wrong.

Elections committee involves a student veto, and adds a third point of scrutiny. It will be able to rule on things such as slates, and makes these in Michaelmas term. Status quo allows an RO to change these things.

Alex Curtis, Chair: Short factual questions?

Tom, Catz, [inaudible 1.16.07]: Staff member RO and DRO – will they be current staff members?

Jack, OUSU: It may be that the staff are new if e.g. someone is new, however a new role isn't being created. They have a requirement in the staff handbook to be impartial.

Lucas, Wadham, Where will the funding come from?

Jack, ousu, he/him: There isn't additional funding required, these are being added to current roles

Aliya Yule, Wadham College: Can staff members be brought into Council and asked questions?

Jack, ousu, no.

Tom, catz, will this be an extra load of work for DSO/chief exec?

Jack, ousu: staff already consulted and are happy with it. DSO already has RO stuff in job description

Marina, St John's, she/her: Currently sabs are on elections committee and so can't endorse candidates or run for other positions- is this retained, and if it has, where is it?

Jack, ousu: [Asked DSO to answer]

Josh, DSO, OUSU: It's in the bye-laws already [searched]

Proceedings moved on whilst Josh searches for answer

Chair, upon finding no other questions, told council to wait.

Jack, ousu: R.e. Aliya's question – council doesn't hold students to account, their jobs do, however because there's a majority of students on the elections committee, who have a majority vote, so there's still a huge amount of say.

Sam Banks, Merton, he/him: Sabb officers are not allowed to stand elections as part of eligibility regulations. Elections committee has to make ruling on whether or not sabs can endorse candidates

Jack, ousu: just as elections committee makes rulings on slates etc.

Aliya Yule, Wadham: Not about hurting the DSO – about bureaucratization of SUs, real risk of students not being able to have oversight into their democracy when the people who run the democracy are not members of the room, and cannot be asked questions. I understand that there is a majority of students on the elections committee, however having run in a number of elections, communication is poor, and it will often just be ROs taking individual decisions. Moreover, we hold them to

account by threatening them with their jobs – however they'll only be fired if there's a major thing – what often happens in elections as I've encountered them, is that it's small micro aggressions which make it harder for certain people to run. Staff members are not neutral – when it comes to individual interactions, they are conditioned by society. They also won't be neutral because the winners are so central in OUSU structure, and staff will have to work with them every day, so staff won't be neutral. This won't mean that they'll rig the election (and so can then be fired) however there is no way in which the student body can ask them 'how did it go?'/ 'tell us about it' – I urge people to – I don't know how this would work – amend this such that it's students who stay in charge'.

Chair: stick to 90 secs

Marina, St John's: Few concerns – expressed them last council. Doesn't feel that there has been proper consultation. When taken to council as item for debate, it had already been agreed what was going to be brought to council. We have a document called the *Student Consultation Benchmark* and we are not following the standards set out there. There are outstanding questions such as how elections in council would work. There is a huge concern about loss of student opportunities – lost the part time exec already, and this is another huge role. Not pleasant for me to oppose this, and as a trustee I completely understand the arguments around risk. However, as a trustee our charitable objectives must be met, and the DRO roles allow us to offer roles to students.

Chair: Thanks for the speech, any amendments/procedural motions?

Jack, ousu: Firstly: Student opportunities will be expanded – can't look at changes in isolation. We're introducing micro-internships with various departments which didn't exist before. In terms of removing students power – this way students will have the power to overrule the elections committee. Sabbs have their own biases and cannot currently be overruled. This way adds greater accountability.

Chair: Amendments etc.

Sam Banks, Merton: In the proposal regulation 5.4 – RO must submit risk register by the end of term – so the RO does have to tell council what is going on. Not sure the last time that there was a contested RO position, so not sure it's such a loss of student opportunity.

Marina, St John's: Contested elections for RO last year leading into Michaelmas term

Tom, Wadham: Marina accused us of not following our own guidelines, that's very concerning – can you respond?

Jack, OUSU: No, as I don't have the document in front of me, however as chair of the trustees I can tell you that these changes were run past the trustees twice and no points were raised about these concerns during the process. There were changes made since the students have inputted in last week council.

Amy, Hertford: Would it be possible to amend to let RO give one speech to council?

Jack, OUSU: I believe that the staff member could make a report, but I believe wouldn't be able to answer questions

Marina, St John's: That would set a really bad precedent, as OUSU staff are subject to different procedures to elected officers. As soon as we start scrutinizing staff members, that's a massive change.

Jack, OUSU: the elected three officers however would be able to report back to council, and there's the report written by the RO

Aliya, Wadham: As I understand it, no staff can't come here and speak. If they can, they can't be held accountable – they could say 'haha, boo sucks to you' and there's nothing that would happen because they're not elected. They're not hired by students, they're hired by bureaucracy – we don't have any control over who they are, unlike the RO. Really big problem if we take away the RO election. Since I've been here council has halved in size since getting rid of the PTE, student representative inside democracy are really important, so please vote against the motion.

The chair confirmed the quorum of the meeting; it was established that there were 35 members

Tom, Cats, He/him: With my experience of who gets involved in elections, I would be inclined to vote against at this point because of similar lines to Aliya. We have a group of students who are a little bit nerdy, run elections and like getting involved, currently these are the people in these positions of RO etc... Now we're going to have to go to these same people who then have to filter these views and take them to someone else. This is not the same level of scrutiny.

Chair: back to Jack, then move to vote

Jack: In terms of whether or not students have a say when it comes to the appointment of staff, when it comes to our CEO making appointments 50% of the students who make up that panel are elected students; ten of our board are elected students/sabb trustees. There is still a clear voice throughout the bureaucracy. I am here because it gives a better voice to students, as they have a majority. We have faith in the ability of the staff to run elections, and they can be held to account by a weighty means.

Tom: I support what you just said, and I think this motion is a good one – the way we hold current RO/DROs to account is remove them from office two weeks early, which is being contrasted with a clear disciplinary process. I think this should pass.

[???] I would like to stress Aliya's point – it's a closed room. At what point, would we actually decide to fire somebody? I think it's really good that lots of students should be involved in democracy, I think that's really important as well.

Chair: Can we move to a vote – any opposition to moving to vote?

Move to vote

Vote

9 in favour, 15 against, 9 abstentions.

Hung vote.

Below the line

4. Revision to the STUDENTSplus Constitution

Council Notes:

1. This is to bring in line the constitution of STUDENTSplus with the other OUSU Campaigns after the Trinity 2016 Byelaws changes that came into effect in Hilary 2016.
2. STUDENTSplus was never updated via Council.
3. The updated constitution introduces Parents & Carers alongside Part-Time Students into the campaign alongside Mature Students to reflect that OUSU could be campaigning and working towards the additional/diverse needs of our members.

Council Resolves:

1. To accept the updated STUDENTSplus constitution.

Proposed: Marina Iambrakis, OUSU

Seconded: Rizwanan Rashid, St Cross College

f. Items for debate

g. Any other business