

Council Minutes

5th Week Michaelmas Term 2015

5th Week Council took place at 5:30pm on Wednesday 11th November 2015, at St Anne's College, The Tsuzuki Lecture Theatre.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, please feel free to contact the Chair, Jack Matthews, 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 and questions to the Sabbatical Officers, Executive Officers, Divisional Board Representatives, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (*Raise and Give*)
- f. Emergency motions
- g. Passage of motions without discussion
- h. Motions of No Confidence or censure
- i. Motions to amend Bye-Laws, General Regulations or Election Regulations
- j. Motions authorising expenditure
- k. Other motions
 1. Access Vision (*This motion, if passed, will be followed by a short debate.*)
 2. Bumpy Cowley Road
 3. OUSU Freshers' Fair Charges
- l. Topical Debate
 1. Higher Education Green Paper (see Appendix 1 for Introduction Higher Education Green Paper)
- m. Any other business
 1. Student Written Submission

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Nikhil Venkatesh (Corpus Christi) – Stated that his point was in relation to interpretation and wording regarding the motion on Prevent from third week council. Informed council that Aliya was minuted as explaining 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”. Explained that the motion was about the implementation of Prevent, and that this was not what Aliya meant. Added that Aliya could not be present but had sent the following email: “The position is that we want students to engage and be very vocal in their opposition to Prevent, and that it is when Prevent starts to be implemented that the mandate takes hold.” Reiterated that it is the implementation of Prevent, rather than Prevent, that students are mandated to not be involved in.

Jack Matthews (University) – Informed council, on that point, that council is recorded, not to be published, but simply for the matter of making the minutes easier. Clarified that what was written, was a direct quote of what was said, and that it is his belief, though council may correct him, that both the minutes are an accurate recording of what was said, and that council was of the belief that if it passed that motion, officers were to walk out of committees were Prevent to

be discussed, and that this is what council voted on and approved. Added that it is his opinion that if that were not the intention of the proposers, then the matter should come back to council. Clarified that it is for council to decide, but this is the impression that he was under. Urged council to correct him or the record if they did not agree and recommended that a motion come back to 7th week council if there is continued ambiguity. Stated that it could also be dealt with further through a special or extraordinary council.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Echoed Jack's points that he does not see any ambiguity in the amendment's wording "to walk out of committees if Prevent is raised", for the purpose of ensuring that we do what council want us to do.

Nikhil – Stated that he would be happy to come back to council and clarify what they meant.

b. Matters Arising from the Minutes

Jack Matthews (University) – Noted that we have implemented the Green Council motion passed at the previous meeting.

c. Ratifications in Council

None.

d. Elections in Council

Deputy Returning Officer – Anna Mowbray (New) nominated.

No hust requested.

Anna – 60
RON – 0
SBV - 1

Anna Mowbray was elected.

1 Position for Scrutiny Committee – Dan Mead (St John's) nominated.

No hust requested.

Dan – 60
RON – 0
SBV - 1

Dan Mead was elected.

4 Positions for Complaints Committee – Sudhakar Brodie (Keble) and Nicole Teoh (St Anne's) nominated.

No hust requested.
Sudhakar – 32
Nicole – 28
RON – 0

Sudhakar Brodie and Nicole Teoh were 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*)

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Highlighted the Student Written Submission, which would be discussed in any other business. Flagged an International Students' Campaign meeting on Sunday at 3pm, almost certainly at Keble. Urged students to come along. Noted that there are a high number of vacancies arising after the elections, particularly in graduate positions, as well as student trustees. Informed council that it is very important that people sit on the board and act as a counter balance to the sabbs. Urged people to get involved.

Cat Jones (Pembroke) – Updated council on the progress of the Suspended Status Students' Campaign, which now has a structure, as well as a chair, and will have a constitution coming to the next meeting of council. Noted that students could follow suscam on Facebook or Twitter.

Ali Lennon (St John's) – Informed council that last week in the Sub-Committee for Student Health and Welfare, the decision was made to completely scrap the existing mental health policy and start afresh, looking for a more progressive, inclusive and suitable policy. Noted that OUSU have also started to do some collaboration with Sexpression, promoting HIV awareness, which in two weeks from now will have testing events.

Becky Howe (Pembroke) – Highlighted the government's Green Paper on higher education has now been released after months of waiting, and contains some pretty concerning things. Added that this would be discussed at the end of the council meeting. Noted that she has fulfilled one of her pledges, holding a training day for all MCR and JCR presidents, which was successful with very good feedback.

Emily Silcock (New) – Informed council that along with her PTE Fairlie, she has been running Veggie Pledge, which so far has 712 people signed up from 33 colleges. Also noted that last week the city council would be reviewing the constituency boundaries based on the data from this year's voters, rather than next year as they had previously claimed. This will be the registered voters they have on record by the 11th November, which currently includes about ten students, as the list is wiped every September. Urged people to run as many voter registration sessions across commons rooms as possible over the next few weeks.

Ellie Milnes-Smith (St John's) – Asked if the reports to council could appear online in a more timely fashion.

Emily Silcock (New) – Responded that we are mid-elections, and the Democratic Support Officer has a very busy time at present.

Colin Malaney (Queen's) – Asked for an update on the sanitary scheme on behalf of his welfare rep.

Emily – Answered that it is going ahead, and that he should contact Lucy Delaney, VP Women, for further details.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – Explained that since she has submitted a report, she has started a campaign to save the Taylor Slavonic Library, which is her own library, but will also affect graduate students academically.

Jacob Page (St Cross) – Reported that in Graduate School Committee last week, they managed to create 6 doctoral training programmes for excellent students, which will have an emphasis on awarding them fully funded DPhils. Added that after excellence has been established, they will be awarded on economic background, which will be positive for students from under represented backgrounds.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Reported on behalf of the student trustees, and directed council to both her summary report, as well as the full minutes of the previous meeting on the OUSU website. Encouraged council to ask questions about the meeting, which involved a lot of strategy about where OUSU is going in the next five years.

f. Emergency motions

None

g. Passage of motions without discussion

1. Access Vision

Council Notes:

1. The creation last year of OUSU's Education Vision, a strategic document outlining beliefs about academic provision and campaigning priorities.
2. That improving access to both undergraduate and graduate education is a key strategic priority for the University¹.
3. The University's participation in the Postgraduate Support Scheme and the research conducted into barriers to postgraduate education; the final report² demonstrates that many barriers to undergraduate education persist into postgraduate study.
4. Oxford's undergraduate admissions statistics (especially in terms of state/private education from UK applicants [56/44%], family income [>50% with incomes above £65,000], and race [particularly in the gap between applications and acceptances]) continue to be unrepresentative of the population.

Council Believes:

1. It is imperative that potential students are not deterred from applying to Oxford, at undergraduate or postgraduate level, due to factors such as finance, class, race, or the many other barriers that exist.
2. The University, colleges and OUSU should continue to invest in access programmes, and work towards a more diverse collegiate University.
3. It is important for OUSU to clarify its strategic priorities in terms of access, in order to campaign effectively.
4. Access means many things, and it is crucial that the term is used broadly, and defined

¹ <http://www.ox.ac.uk/about/organisation/strategic-plan> (see 3d)

² http://www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/field/field_document/Oxford%20PSS%20pilot%20-%20end%20of%20project%20report,%20September%202015.pdf

only after consultation with relevant groups.

5. That access to postgraduate education remains a significant issue as well as access to undergraduate education.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the Vice President (Access & Academic Affairs) and Vice President (Graduates) to work towards producing an Access Vision, outlining students' beliefs about access to Oxford education, and OUSU's campaigning priorities on access.
2. To mandate the Vice President (Access & Academic Affairs) and Vice President (Graduates) to set up a working group to produce the Vision.
3. To mandate the Vice President (Access & Academic Affairs) and Vice President (Graduates) to bring the broad parameters of the Vision to Council in Hilary Term 2016, and the Vision itself in Trinity Term 2016.
4. To discuss, after the passing of this motion, which groups it is important to consult with, and initial thoughts of the parameters of the Vision.

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Catherine Jones (Pembroke)

Motion passed without discussion, triggering resolves 4, 'to discuss, after the passing of this motion, which groups it is important to consult with, and initial thoughts of the parameters of the Vision'.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Reported that the Education Vision was very useful for establishing key campaigning areas for education, and that OUSU would now like to do the same thing for access. Clarified that he would not be defining the term access, as that is really what this process is there for. Suggested that what people want is for there to be as few barriers as possible to education at Oxford, both at undergraduate and postgraduate level, and to get the best people studying at Oxford. Explained that the Access Vision will be an evidence based document, saying what does OUSU believe about access, including what access is, what it means, and what you want the sabbatical officers and executive to campaign on. Suggested that it would be useful to think about which groups you think it is particularly important that we do targeted consultations with with, in addition to a consultation that we will do with all students, as well as anything that you think should feature in the vision, as our campaigning priorities around access, both at the undergraduate and postgraduate level.

Tom Wadsworth (St John's) – Stated that disability is important and often forgotten, and added that it should be looked at in different groups as it is a very broad term. Suggested separating, as an example, physical disabilities and invisible disabilities.

Ronak Patel (University) – Informed council that he was attending on behalf of OSDC, and agreed that disabled groups should be consulted in different factions, including a mental health subgroup. Explained that there are a number of issues with the admissions process, which affect a variety of students, including students with anxiety problems, and students with learning and reading difficulties, who have to read a passage of text in the interview.

Nikhil Venkatesh (Corpus Christi) – Noted that often that when we talk about access, it is tied in with marketing the University and getting people to apply, and obviously people cannot access an education here unless admitted. Explained that it is not just, and not even mainly, that factors such as race deter people from applying to Oxford, it is that when black people for example apply to Oxford, they have less than half of the chance of being admitted as a white

applicant, therefore claimed it is really important that admissions policies are a key part of an access vision, as well as funding applications for graduate students.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – Suggested that it is important to consult with the First Generation Students Campaign, as well as international students, particularly graduate international students, and more generally non-domestic students, mature students, student parents and carers, and part time students, especially as we do not have an officer for them.

Jacob Page (St Cross) – Suggested talking to schools, as sitting on a divisional board has highlighted the fact that we need more applicants for a diverse range of backgrounds.

Jack Hampton (St Catherine's) – Noted it would be very useful to talk to the Suspended Students Campaign, as they would provide knowledge on access issues affecting students while suspended, as well as access problems that are faced across a very diverse range of issues.

Greg Auger (St John's) – Claimed it would be really key to look at some statistics and data, including data which relates to students of different identities, as well as looking much more broadly at the stage of the application process that certain groups are not applying, not getting interviews etc., so we have a very informed access vision.

Jessy Parker Humphreys (Jesus) – Suggested that it could be interesting to look at age, including what age you have to start thinking about Oxford in order for it to be feasible to get in.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Stated that regarding the parameters of the vision, we should be talking about access to degrees and people getting the best degrees that they are capable of, which involves dealing with the race and gender gap at finals, which has actually grown over the past couple of years. Urged that we need to be talking about what type of education people can actually access, and how their identity/background/circumstances, and the way they might be treated here might affect that.

Taisie (Wadham) – Noted that many qualifications from a lot of countries around the world are not accepted by Oxford, which will clearly be putting off a lot of students. Suggested that OUSU look into to changing this approach by the University.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Added that we need to think about postgraduates who have never been to this country before, and will not come to this country before for they start their course, as well as how we will use technology to better achieve our access aims.

Cameron Quinn (Merton) – Stated that the vision should pay attention to the fact that a lot of so called access work can end up being PR or whitewashing, and that we need to consider honesty within access, as it will not necessarily be the case that everyone comes here and has as good a time as access work tends to sell, which is a hard truth to get to grips with. Added that the vision needs to consider the kind of experience that people have here.

Cat Jones (Pembroke) Asked council to think about international access, which is a fascinating area, and something which we undoubtedly need to do more on. Explained it becomes controversial when we consider the balance between international access and home access, and what we as a student body think that looks like. Questioned what our ideal undergraduate body would look like if we were to recruit the best and brightest from across the whole world, including where our resources would go and what we would prioritise.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – Replied that she does not have an answer to Cat's question, but that improved technology and moving things online is definitely the way to go, as we do not currently capture international postgraduates in particular.

Jacob Page (St Cross) – Noted that a significant proportion of postgraduate students are international in MPLS, and he believes that his division are starting to look into this, so may be worth speaking to.

h. Motions of No Confidence or censure

None.

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

None.

j. Motions authorising expenditure

None.

k. Other motions

2. Bumpy Cowley Road

Council Notes:

1. Lots of students live on or around Cowley Road, requiring them to cycle up or down it every day.
2. Cowley Road has lots of potholes making it quite an uncomfortable road to cycle up or down every day.
3. Potholes can be dangerous, causing cyclists to swerve or lose control, particularly at night.
4. Potholes give cyclists sore bottoms.
5. That this predicament may affect other roads in Oxford but the proposer of this motion mainly cycles along Cowley Road.

Council Believes:

1. Students have a right to cycle up or down Cowley Road, free from danger and sore bottoms.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the President and/or VP (Charity and Communities) to lobby the City Council to retarmac Cowley Road.
2. To mandate the President and/or VP (Charity and Communities) to investigate potholes in other parts of the city which are not Cowley Road.

Proposed: Jessy Parker Humphreys (Jesus)

Seconded: Eden Bailey (Magdalen)

Jessy Parker Humphreys (Jesus) – Noted that this is not the most serious motion to ever come to Council, but acknowledged that it is important. Explained that they cycle up and down the Cowley Road regularly, and the potholes hurt, and can also be dangerous, so this motion is to ask the President and VP Charities and Community to lobby the council to look into filling them in.

Emily Silcock (New) – Asked Jessy if they have filled in the council's online pothole reporter.

Jessy – Responded that they had not, however, there are so many potholes that it would take up a lot of time. Noted that this is a wider problem than just specific potholes.

Emily – Informed council that all she can do if mandated is fill in the pothole reporter, as she does not have a meeting with the county council until next term, and it will be them who deal with it. Suggested that she send the link over to Jessy, who knows mores about where the potholes are than she does.

Jessy – Noted that the motion, although referring specifically to Cowley Road, is meant to highlight the general pothole problem in Oxford.

Emily – Agreed that it is every annoying, but reiterated that all she can do at this stage is fill in the form.

Ali – Informed council that Emily is very busy, and Jessy clearly knows more. Suggested that this would not be the best use of Emily's time.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Asked when Emily will next be meeting with the County Council, and if this could be put on the agenda of that meeting as a broader issue.

Emily – Replied that she has roughly termly meetings with the leader of the county council, who obviously does not have a direct mandate over the potholes. Explained that it took her from the beginning of the summer, until a couple of weeks ago to have a meeting, based on limited availability.

Jacob Page (St Cross) – Noted that Oxford is going though a lot of infrastructure changes at the moment, and asked if this will be a part of a broader plan for the council already.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Informed council that he has just tweeted a link to the pothole reporter.

Jessy – Agreed that she will fill in the pothole reported, but would like this to be raised as a wider issue if Emily is to meet with the County Council.

Vote:

For - 40

Against - 8

Abstain - 17

Motion passed.

3. OUSU Freshers' Fair

Council Notes:

1. OUSU charges £40 for a single table, £90 for two tables and £140 for three tables at its Freshers' Fair.
2. OUSU further charges £30 to replace a lost lanyard.
3. OUSU's lanyards are just pieces of printed paper in cheap plastic wallets.
4. Most universities do not charge at all for tables at Freshers' Fair.
5. Some Presidents of some smaller societies have had to pay out of their own pocket to fund a table at Freshers' Fair.

Council Believes:

1. A students' union should not be making money off the back of its students.
2. Even if OUSU is facing funding shortfalls elsewhere, these should not be made up by unnecessary and obstructive costs for societies to have tables at Freshers' Fair.
3. Charging £30 to replace a lanyard consisting of a piece of printed paper in a cheap plastic wallet is exorbitant and unnecessary.
4. No society President should have to fund a table at an SU Freshers' Fair out of their own pocket.

Council Resolves:

1. Express a formal disapproval of the charges which OUSU sets for the Freshers' Fair.
2. Seek the Council's opinion concerning the abolition of such charges for future Freshers' Fairs ahead of the preparations for the 2016 Freshers' Fair.

Proposed: Edward Saunders (New College)

Seconded: Dhruv Jayanth (New College)

Amendment 1

To add Notes 6 to 8:

6. That Examination Schools charges OUSU £15,948 for use of the building for Freshers' Fair. The marquee at the event costs a further £11,000.
7. That student stalls are heavily subsidised by the commercial stalls that are in this marquee.
8. That the University's Clubs Committee gives start-up grants and special purposes grants and loans to registered clubs and societies.

And to replace Believes 1 to 3 with:

1. Freshers' Fair is a central part of the student experience, and is expected by Freshers.
2. The University should ensure the continued sustainability of Freshers' Fair, in light of student concerns about stall costs.
3. The cost of Exam Schools given in Notes 6 is excessive.

And replace resolves 1 with: "Express a formal disapproval of the charges which Exam Schools sets for Freshers' Fair."

And to add Resolves 3 and 4:

3. To mandate the President to lobby the University to further subsidise Exam Schools for Freshers' Fair.
4. To mandate the President to advise clubs and societies (via the all-student email or otherwise) of the Clubs Committee grants before the Committee's Hilary Term deadline.

Proposed: Becky Howe (Pembroke)

Seconded: Nick Cooper (St. John's)

Dhruv Jayanth (New College) – Informed council that they brought this motion forward as it was unanimously passed in their JCR meeting, following the fact that a number of societies were unable to afford a table at Freshers Fair. Stated that they wanted to express disapproval of this, and gauge the feeling of council, as this is not an issue for New College only.

Moved on to discuss the amendment.

Becky Howe (Pembroke) – Thanked the proposers for bringing the motion, as it is really important that OUSU receive feedback and find out what issues students have with what we are doing. Stated that she will not repeat the whole amendment but highlighted the main points, informing council that the fair is incredibly expensive, with the Exam Schools charging us almost £16,000, and the marquee costing £11,000. Informed council that we do not want to charge £40 for stalls, but that we want to run the fair and cannot do it without charging. Noted that regarding the lanyards, no-one was actually charged for losing them, and that this was there as a deterrent, as for safety reasons, we cannot give out more lanyards than we are allowed people in the building. Added that the amendment shows that she is happy to further lobby the University to reduce the cost of Exam Schools, as that is the major cost, and will also raise awareness of the grants that the proctors are able to provide to societies.

Amendment opposed by the proposers.

Edward Saunders (New College) – Agreed with elements of the amendment, however in general it overturns the original intent of the motion, which was to express the disapproval of council towards the charges for students. Noted that the cost of Exam Schools should be addressed, but we should not be passing the book onto the University, rather than acknowledging that OUSU has a responsibility to ensure that Freshers Fair is accessible, as it is absolutely an important part of the University experience. Argued that considering that the fair operates at a profit, there is room for further subsidising the cost.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Agreed that everything that has been said is perfectly reasonable, however we simply would not be able to run the fair without charging students, based on our current funding model. Noted that it had been raised regularly, and quite rightly, that we are one of the few student unions in the country that charge for their fair, but that we don't have a choice in the matter, and we are also one of the smallest student unions in the country in terms of the grant we get from the University, clarifying that the amount we get per student comes out at £29 each. Explained that if you take the cost of the student stalls at Freshers' Fair, and you take the income we get from each £40, we actually make a £5000 loss, therefore if we didn't run this part, we would actually make more money, however we acknowledge that it is really important that we do. Accepted that we do make a profit on the commercial side, as we have to have a separate commercial arm in order to run that part, and it has to make a profit in order to exist. Confirmed that the profit which is made from the commercial side of the fair is invested back into OUSU in order to support the other services which we provide, therefore if

we take a further cut, these services will suffer. Echoed Becky's point about societies applying for money from the Clubs Committee.

Colin Malaney (Queen's) – Suggested that it is a particular problem for small societies, and asked if it would be possible to charge more for the second tables, as it tends to be big societies that can afford them, in order to balance it out, and allow the first table for less money.

Edward Saunders – Noted that the profits are going back into OUSU to provide services, and questioned if it would not make more sense if this investment went back into the fair, and subsidized the student element of the fair.

Emily Silcock (New) – Answered that we already do charge more for the second table and asked if Colin meant even more.

Colin - Confirmed that he did.

Emily – Replied that it could be looked into. Answered Edward, and explained that this would basically mean OUSU cutting their own budget, with a variety of things from welfare supplies to people patrolling the streets looking after students suffering as a result. Confirmed that students can vote for this if they want, but other services would have to be cut as a result.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Suggested that there must be a solution somewhere in the middle, and accepted that while it is not acceptable that small societies cannot afford a table, it is also not feasible to ask the trustees to effectively bankrupt us. Suggested that we go away, and come up with some creative solutions to either dramatically reduce that price, or eliminate it altogether, such as the President and the Clubs and Societies Officer working with the smaller societies to produce an action plan to support them.

Cat Jones (Pembroke) – Agreed with Eden, but clarified that what the amendment says is exactly what Eden is describing.

Moved to vote on the amendment:

For – 60

Against – 4

Abstain – 7

Amendment passed.

Jack Matthews (University) – Asked if the proposers of the motion would like to remain the proposers of the newly amended moment.

Edward and Dhruv - Agreed that they would.

Amendment received:

To add:

Resolves 5: To mandate the President to work with the proposer and seconder of the motion to create a "supporting new clubs and societies" plan, which includes methods of financial support for Freshers' Fair.

Proposed: Eden Tanner (St John's)

Seconded: Edward Saunders (New)

Becky Howe – Requested clarification, asking if it is for OUSU to give money to new clubs and societies, or for them to provide moral support and advice.

Eden – Answered that the facilitating of financial support could mean giving money, or could alternatively mean, helping them fill out an application for Clubs Committee, depending on your interpretation.

Amendment opposed.

Ali Lennon (St John's) – Requested that the mandate is placed on the Clubs and Societies Officer, rather than Becky, as this would fall under their role.

Eden – Replied that she will be happy to have both the President and the Clubs and Societies Support Officer, so Becky is able to oversee the work.

With this change, the amendment was passed with no further opposition.

Motion passed as amended.

I. Topical Debate

1. Higher Education Green Paper (see Appendix 1 for Introduction Higher Education Green Paper)

Jack Matthews (University) – Reported that on Friday of 4th Week, the Government released a 35,000 word consultation on Higher Education, which included wide-ranging proposals on access, funding, teaching standards, and Student Union reform, amongst other things, and to assist the sabbatical officers in responding to this consultation, which must be done before the first council of Hilary term, and to give direction to the officers, he has therefore created a topical debate under General Regulation Schedule 2 Paragraph 12. Highlighted a summary produced by Nick Cooper in appendix 1. Reminded council that this is their chance to inform the response of the sabbatical officers.

Vivian Holmes (Wadham) - Asked for information regarding transparency in trade unions, and how they will be affected as political bodies.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Raised a concern that Teaching Excellence Frameworks are marketising our education in that we are now putting a price on the quality of education we are receiving, which enables the government to let the fees rise with inflation, which is dangerous, as Oxford could definitely be in a place to raise fees, which is very concerning.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Responded to Vivian, and explained that there is a very casual reference to staying in line with other reforms to trade unions. Noted that it is concerning, as the reforms to trade unions involve minimum participation, ballots etc.

Duncan Shepherd (Balliol) – Requested that we are forceful about financial burdens being put on OUSU.

Jacob Page (St Cross) – Flagged the Freedom of Information element, and argued that we should be opposing the University being exempt from the Freedom of Information Act, especially after a lot of work has been done on this surrounding examination feedback. Asked what the view is on the combining of the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and the Office for Fair Access (OFFA), and if this would help or hinder access.

Greg Auger (St John's) – Noted that the Green Paper suggests bringing the ability to raise fees from parliament to being something that the government can decide which is very concerning.

Sarah White (St Catherine's) – Agreed and urged that fee rises should certainly not be in the hands of government, and stressed that OUSU need to absolutely hammer that point, as it is appalling.

m. Any other business

1. Student Written Submission (Appendix 2)

Thanks for all your consultation responses. We are currently incorporating these, and our latest draft can be found on the Council website (note: this will be updated daily until Council, to make sure our latest copy is visible to you.) **If you have any comments or thoughts on the draft, please raise them at 5th week Council, or let us know by Monday 6th week (16th Nov).**

After this, we will produce a final version for Council's approval in 7th week. **Given the length of the document, we would like 7th week Council to *approve* the document, rather than discuss it at length.** It will be difficult to make amendments after this date (as we have to submit it), so please please please let us know by Monday 6th week if you have additions/deletions/suggestions, rather than saving them for 7th week Council. Thank you!

Cat Jones (Vice President (Access & Academic Affairs))

Nick Cooper (Vice President (Graduates))

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Reminded council that the Student Written Submission is part of a review that the University is currently undergoing, and informed that we are updating it regularly, and will be continually be replacing the online version with the newest version. Urged council to read it and provide any thoughts by Tuesday as the final deadline.