

Council Minutes

5th Week Michaelmas Term 2016

5th Week Council was at 5:30pm, Wednesday 9th November 2016 at Examination Schools.

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 at dso@ousu.ox.ac.uk. If you have any questions about OUSU Council, please feel free to contact the Chair, Matthew Dawe, at chair@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 Officers, Executive Officers, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (*Raise and Give*)
- e. Items for Resolution
 1. Sabbatical Officer remits
 2. #UnisResistBorderControl
~~Urging the Oxford University Press to withdraw its appeal in the Rameshwari Photocopy Services case before the Delhi High Court~~
(WITHDRAWN)
 3. Central University harassment policy
 4. Oxford Students' Refugee Campaign
 5. Updating guidance for Council's Scrutiny Committee
 6. Orgreave
- f. Items for Debate
- g. Any Other Business

Please Note:

OUSU's team are 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 Matt Tennant, Membership Services Manager (msm@ousu.ox.ac.uk) or Jo Gregory-Brough, Communications Manager (commsmanager@ousu.ox.ac.uk)

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

No issues.

b. Matters Arising from the Minutes

None.

c. Elections in Council

No nominations. Chair: position of Chair of Council and Returning Officer available at next Council.

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

Jack Hampton (St Catz) – last week spent working on Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). University Council discussed ramifications – had big win in limiting fee increases only to some continuing students, saving £2.1m in debt. Still fighting on TEF going forward. Helped organise common room executive training conference, which went well. Helped two JCR Presidents plan their year. Finally spoken to Development Office about structural solutions to underfunding of mental health and welfare support in Oxford.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – also worked on TEF, and pleased with good result. Planning conference on opening up postgraduate study – hoping for Saturday 8th week this term, but need venue. Get in touch if you can help. Festival of Culture has taken place this week – lots of events, culminating in event on cultural assimilation.

Sandy Downs (Corpus) – went to National Union of Students Zone conference. Welfare one good; went also to event looking at hate crimes post Brexit. Also working on event for students going on year abroad – setting up event with Careers Service with pizza early next term. Mind Your Head now have new committee, so now planning lots of events.

Orla White (Brasenose) – mostly training and workshops, including First Response training. Still available if people want to attend. Also working on Queer Consent Workshops with LGBTQ Campaign. Plan to launch properly in Queer Week next week. Helped with common room training as well. Finally focused on harassment policy – motion at this Council. Working with Wadham, Linacre and LGBTQ staff network to run event at Wadham.

Beth Currie (Corpus) – Raised over £7000 with Lost. RAG ball coming up. Over 1600 students have taken part in Veggie Pledge; big change in environmental habits.

Jack Hampton (St Catz) – Richard Brooks coming to next Council – he is National Union of Students Vice President. Opportunity to ask him questions about NUS – they are running big democracy review, so can feed into that.

No questions or further reports.

e. Items for Resolution

1. Sabbatical Officer remits

Council Notes:

1. Its power to set (and amend) remits for OUSU's sabbatical officers. Officers are accountable to Council for carrying out these remits.
2. The current remits, approved in Trinity Term 2014.

Council Believes:

1. The current remits are too vague - and this is problematic because students considering running in elections may not have a clear idea what the roles entail.
2. That the proposed new remits in Appendix 1, written by the current Sabbatical officers, more accurately reflect the duties of the six roles.

Council Resolves:

1. To replace the Sabbatical Trustees' remits with the new remits in Appendix 1.

Proposed: Sandy Downs (Corpus)

Seconded: Eden Bailey (Magdalen)

Amendment received

In Appendix 1, under Vice President (Charities & Community):

Add a bullet point: To act as a point of contact and support (with training and any other appropriate resources) for common room E&E reps and charities/RAG reps.

To add to the sixth bullet point, before "oversee", the word "employ,".

Proposed: Beth Currie (Corpus)

Seconded: Orla White (Brasenose)

Taken as friendly; added to motion.

Sandy Downs (Corpus) – we are revamping advertising of Sabbatical officer roles, so people run for them at elections next term. Will make them more accessible when sending out, but this is the core part of role. Happy to discuss any point.

Lily Johnson (Regent's Park) – unsure what has changed, so difficult to know what to say.

Orla White (Brasenose) – provides a job description so people know what they're running for. Also details staff support, better information on day-to-day work. Ensures important responsibilities are formalised.

Sandy Downs (Corpus) – previous versions were short, and didn't set out what we did. Sets out committees I sit on; campaigns I work on, people I work with, main responsibilities.

Orla – also gives skills you will learn through the job.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – remit self-explanatory. Have been explicit about other groups the Vice-President (Graduates) have responsibility for, including mature, international, part-time students and student parents and carers, whether undergraduate or graduate. Also welfare, access, research and innovation; not just academic affairs. Can also speak for Access & Academic Affairs, as Eden not here: similar to her role, except also responsible for access and outreach of prospective students. Not undergraduate only – mostly undergraduate work, but doesn't have to be.

Jack Hampton (St Catz) – important role of being a Sabbatical officer is you are trustee of OUSU. Gives opportunity to work on strategy and long-term plans; seeing what OUSU will be in 3, 5 years' time, and how to run organisation. Also have a trading subsidiary company, and four sabbatical officers are also directors of company. Get responsibility of being Sabbatical officer, charity trustee, and company director. Only further additions to President remit is emphasising responsibility for

looking after JCR Presidents – key part of role – and general team development as we have a flat structure of Sabbatical officers. If interested in role, ask questions.

Beth – old remits made role seem like a student life officer; work-life balance. However not as relevant. Role has legal responsibility such as for RAG, employing community wardens. Other responsibilities including liaising with city/county councils, and environmental sustainability.

No further debate. Moved to vote.

Motion passed unanimously.

2. #UnisResistBorderControl

Council Notes:

1. #UnisResistBorderControl is a campaign launched in March 2016 to combat the racist and xenophobic treatment of non-EU international students and migrant workers within UK universities by the Home Office and UK Visa and Immigration (UKVI).
2. A statement by #UnisResistBorderControl, endorsed by over 50 academics, students, and activists.
3. Many international students have their education and very lives threatened by deportation attempts, for instance Luqman Onikosi a disabled student from Nigeria with a chronic liver condition who would face death if removed from the UK.
4. The importance of #UnisResistBorderControls is shown by the fact that Home Secretary, Theresa May has been found to have 'wrongly deported' 48,000 international students'. Since then, the court of appeals in October 2016 ruled against the long-running programme to deport international students on the basis of hearsay evidence.
5. Nevertheless, as the UK finalises the last stages of Brexit, we are contending with ever growing state imposed racism and xenophobia that creates a precarious situation for non-EU and EU students, lecturers, and university staff alike. This is evident in the governmental push for UK universities to be graded in an Olympic-styled system to allocate which university takes on non-EU international students, benefiting top tier universities like Oxford, Cambridge and other Russell Group institutions and further marginalising traditionally racially and ethnically diverse and working class universities, such as London Metropolitan University, which was site to an immigration raid in 2012.

Council Believes:

1. Ultimately, we as students, scholars, and university workers need to interrogate and resist higher education becoming a tool for the political elite to enforce further inequalities that turn the spirit of learning and knowledge into a racist and xenophobic money making endeavour, and strengthening right-wing nationalism.

2. We must combat racism, xenophobia and state surveillance via UKVI and PREVENT within our university.
3. We must support EU and non-EU international students, especially those who are Black and people of colour, from racist and xenophobic university and state action.
4. We must also support financially and legally EU & non-EU international student and staff activists and campaigns, such as SOAS Justice for Cleaners, Justice4Sanaz, #DontDeportLuqman, #SaveKelechi, #SaveLord and any other EU and non-EU international student experiencing institutional and state action.

Council Resolves:

1. To support the #UnisResistBorderControls campaign by funding a twice yearly sum of £150 for them to produce a booklet-zine with a 'know your legal rights' information section provided by Garden Court Chambers London for each academic year to incoming non-EU international students.
2. To put a £300 donation for the In Limbo For Justice documentary project currently being produced jointly by Unis Resist Border Controls and Justice4Sanaz.
3. To support sharing the crowdfunder with contacts within Oxford University Student Union and encourage more discussion around issues discussed within the trailer of the film.
4. To help UnisResistBorderControls put together a pro-bono legal clinic of legal scholars, barristers, solicitors and legal students at Oxford University who would be willing to provide pro-bono legal support for non-EU international students who find themselves encounter legal problems with the Home Office and UK Visa and Immigration.

Proposed: Meera Sachdeva (LMH)

Seconded: Marcelo Nascimiento (Wadham)

Motion withdrawn – proposer may bring back in amended form at 7th week Council.

Urging the Oxford University Press to withdraw its appeal in the Rameshwari Photocopy Services case before the Delhi High Court (referred from 3rd week Council)

Withdrawn on request of proposers – will return at 7th week Council.

3. Central University harassment policy

Council Notes:

1. That Universities UK has released a report on sexual violence, harassment and hate crime, with special focus on disciplinary breaches which may also be criminal.
2. Previously, the recommendations made to UK universities on dealing with potential criminal acts, especially sexual violence, were to ignore and defer responsibility.
3. That the UUK report specifically urges universities not only to take a proactive stance on dealing with disciplinary breaches that may be criminal, but to publicise and make these policies clear and well-understood.
4. That currently there is University policy which allows for disciplinary action to be taken in the case of acts which may be criminal, but that it is unclear and inaccessible, and that this makes reporting harassment, sexual violence and hate crime very difficult.

5. That the UUK report also makes the case for clear centralised systems and clarification of the extent of university jurisdiction over disciplinary matters, especially those which may also be criminal.
6. That currently the college system and the variation in standards of care across the University prevent such clarity.

Council Believes:

1. That many students feel unsafe and unsupported, and do not know how to use University or college harassment policies.
2. That the University has a duty of care towards its students and should exercise that duty of care to its fullest extent.
3. That the central University policy should be revised to reflect the recommendations in the UUK report;
4. That college policies should be revised to reflect and complement this revised central policy.
5. That any revision of the policy in line with UUK recommendations must seriously consider the current lack of clear information on college/University jurisdiction.
6. That students should be involved throughout this process.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate OUSU sabbatical officers to lobby for a revision of the current policy based on the UUK taskforce report as a matter of urgency.
2. To support attempts to standardise policy across colleges.

Proposed: Orla White (Brasenose)

Seconded: Tuesday Doherty (Worcester)

Orla White (Brasenose) – the harassment policy has always been shaped by students. University policy amended in 2015-2016 - amended version has filtered down to some colleges but not all. Central policy is decent, by standards we work at. Know there are holes in it; have received complaints. Report has come out by Universities UK, looking at legal relationship between students and university. Previous guidelines say university shouldn't get involved in sexual violence cases and should pass to police; now, recommend the university can deal with matter using own disciplinary procedures. Changing policy would be difficult at most universities; even harder at collegiate university. Need to change at every college after central policy. Motion mandates us to look at revising current policy, and try to standardise across colleges. Won't be easy but important to do.

Jess Colston (St John's) – for colleges whose policies follow the University's, how much work will be needed if the University's changes?

Orla – very different between college adopting university policy and having their own. May need re-evaluation of the jurisdiction of colleges versus the university. Depends how much college agrees, and puts university policy into practice.

No further debate. Move to vote.

Motion passed unanimously.

4. Oxford Students Refugee Campaign

Council Notes:

1. The ongoing refugee crisis has displaced many thousands of students worldwide.
2. These students have been deprived of the chance to pursue higher education courses in their native countries or in the country they currently reside.
3. These students are often in extraneous circumstances where access to funding for application fees and language entrance examinations are difficult, and previous transcripts and official records of qualification are unavailable.
4. The University of Oxford and its constituent colleges have yet to provide funded scholarships to specifically support refugee students from all parts of the world.
5. The University of Oxford has a tradition of aiding students seeking asylum as proven by the efforts of the Bureau of Information for Refugee Scholars in the 1930s.
6. Several other UK Universities have committed to funding scholarship places.
7. The Oxford Students Refugee Campaign have garnered the support of more than 11,000 students and have been pledged more than £240,000 at the student level.
8. Most colleges that have accepted motions to pledge money to the campaign have yet to live up to their pledge and collect funds for the campaign.

Council Believes:

1. The University of Oxford has a moral duty and the resources to support refugee students.
2. The University of Oxford should provide access to higher education based on merit, not nationality, immigration status, or race.
3. Given that the University of Oxford is one of the leading universities in the world, by supporting this cause, it has the potential to influence the policy pertaining to student refugees at an international level.

Council Resolves:

1. Mandate the Sabbatical officers to call on the University to provide a proportionate, clear and comprehensive institutional response to welcome students who are fleeing persecution by classifying them as home students and creating studentships or bursaries.
2. Mandate the Sabbatical officers to call on the University of Oxford to make compromises with potential applicants regarding application requirements in situations where test centres are inaccessible due to visa requirements or safety reasons, or when transcripts are lost.
3. Mandate the Sabbatical officers to call on each Junior and Middle Common Room in Oxford, to financially support the expected tuition and living costs incurred by a refugee student studying at the University.
4. Mandate the Sabbatical officers to call on each Junior and Middle Common Room in Oxford that have accepted to financially support the expected tuition and living costs incurred by a refugee student studying at the University to follow up with each Junior and Middle Common Room to live up to their financial pledge as soon as possible.

Proposed: Thaís Roque (Magdalen)

Seconded: Beth Currie (Corpus)

Beth Currie (Corpus) – this campaign is a subset of OUSU’s Global Justice campaign. Successful in encouraging common rooms to take part. University are ones who provide service – so mandates us to demand for university to make this institutional.

Taisie Tsikas (Wadham) – Believes 3 about influencing other universities, is there an action plan?

Beth – university often uses this programme as an example if asked what they do on social justice. Expect they’ll ask Vice Chancellor to issue statement about the work done.

Tim Foot (Merton) – what proportion of common rooms already had process in place?

Beth – think it’s about half, but fewer have collected money, or transferred it to the campaign. Want to hassle common rooms to actually pass money on.

Thierry Schutz (Harris Manchester) – in Resolves 1, how much legal leeway do university have on counting students as “Home”? Are we calling on them to do something they can’t do?

Beth – not sure. University suggest they have little leeway; has gone to University committees previously. University won’t even waive £75 graduate application fee, so we have to cover.

Annie Williamson (Balliol) – understanding is that they do have some leeway to class students as “home” if they want to achieve intent.

Tim Foot (Merton) – in Resolves 2, would “allowances” be better term than “compromises”, as doesn’t seem to be what campaign or we want, for admissions?

Beth – happy to take as friendly amendment.

Catherine Kelly (St Hugh’s) – is there somewhere to access information about the campaign?

Beth – have website. Google Oxford Refugee Campaign – extensive resources.

Amendment received

In Resolves 2, replace “compromises” with “allowances”.

Proposed: Timothy Foot (Merton)

Seconded: Beth Currie (Corpus)

Taken as friendly; added to motion.

Motion passed – 43 in favour, 2 abstentions.

5. Updating guidance for Council's Scrutiny Committee

Council Notes:

1. That formal policy for scrutiny is unclear at the moment with the Bye-Laws and OUSU Policy barely touching upon it.
2. That Scrutiny Committee has not been updated in line with the recent changes to the OUSU Bye-laws and governing documents which restructured OUSU.

Council Believes:

1. Scrutiny of our officers not only lets our students evaluate how well their elected representatives are doing in their jobs, but also allows our elected officers to better think about how to grow in the role.
2. That if used correctly scrutiny of our officers will increase the profile of their work by examining it from an uninvolved perspective.
3. Official policy clarifying the work of a committee is not really a bad thing.

Council Resolves:

1. To shrink the current committee from 4 to 2 members to reflect the reduction of the work load to just scrutinising the sabbatical officers.
2. That each member of Scrutiny Committee should undertake an interview with each member of the sabbatical team (this should normally take the form of 3 shorter and 3 longer interviews each so that each officer shall receive one long and one short interview each from a different person).
3. That all findings the committee makes should be unanimous among the two people as there will no longer be a formal chair.
4. That the committee should normally present its report at 7th week council, where it shall be voted on by OUSU Council.
5. That Sabbatical officers should be judged both on the pledges they made to the students of the university in their manifestos and on the goals they set themselves in the first report to Council of the year.
6. To update OUSU Policy on attendance at Council for sabbatical officers due to the removal of Part-Time Officers, in line with Appendix 2 below.
7. To amend OUSU's Bye-Laws as follows to reflect these changes (track changes version in Appendix 2 below):
 - a. In Bye-Law 9.6, replace "four" with "two".
 - b. In Bye-Law 10.2, replace "The chair of the Scrutiny Committee" with "The Scrutiny Committee", and "the chair" with "it".
 - c. In Bye-Law 10.3, delete "the chair of".
8. To make Council Resolves 2-4 OUSU policy.

Proposed: Dan Mead (St John's)

Seconded: Joe Small (Jesus)

Dan Mead (St John's) – was chair of Council's Scrutiny Committee in Hilary Term and still on committee. OUSU's part time executive were abolished last term, and need to make changes to

reflect reduced workload. Also makes clear that Scrutiny Committee will base decisions on Sabbatical Officers' pledges as well as goals.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – do you think there are any other OUSU officers that Scrutiny Committee should scrutinise in the future?

Dan Mead (St John's) – we took Divisional Board Reps out of scrutiny last term; chairs of Campaigns, don't feel we're in position to scrutinise liberation campaigns. Otherwise, not many other positions.

Marina - others such as Chair of Council, Returning Officer?

Dan - as long as Returning Officer runs elections well, it's fine. Subjective how well a Chair of Council does; can't see how.

Jack Hampton (St Catz) – changing Sabbatical officer scrutiny so it's based on goals they set. Does this not apply also to Divisional Board representatives?

Dan – when these changes were made last time, decision was made to remove them.

Marina - do you think Scrutiny Committee has a long-term future?

Dan – if we do it in the right way, yes. Not enough knowledge of what Scrutiny do. Also reports are too long, can be boring. Should also make it available to wider student body – important for students to know if officers are representing you in best way. Willing to discuss how to do this.

No further debate. Move to vote.

Motion passed – 41 in favour, 1 abstention.

6. Orgreave

Council Notes:

1. On 18th June 1984, striking miners at the Orgreave coking plant in south Yorkshire were the victims of severe and organized police violence, including the deployment of cavalry.
2. A 2.5 year IPCC 'scoping exercise' conceded that "the unwillingness to disclose evidence of wrongdoing by officers does raise doubts about the ethical standards of officers in the highest ranks of the South Yorkshire Police at the time".
3. Despite an ever-growing body of evidence suggesting severe malpractice on the part of the South Yorkshire Police on that day, the Home Secretary on Monday 1st November refused *any* form of inquiry into the 'Battle of Orgreave'.
4. The basis of the Home Secretary's decision was, putatively, that "ultimately there were no deaths or wrongful convictions".

Council Believes:

1. In the historic and ongoing solidarity and community binding the trade union movement and students in Britain.
2. In the case of Orgreave, the non-occurrence of death or wrongful conviction constitutes an excessive and simplistic criterion for a judicial inquiry.
3. The military-hooligan police methods, 95 wrongful arrests, police statements manufactured by senior officers and unfaltering government support for the police's actions throughout not only deserve a full public inquiry, but were emblematic of the Thatcher government's assault on the British labour movement and northern mining communities.
4. In explaining the decision of 1st November, it is potentially not coincidental that the current government, like that of 1984, belongs to a Conservative Party pervaded by the ideas of Thatcherism.
5. Regardless of what the Home Secretary says, a judicial investigation into the military style policing used on that day is now long overdue and only a full public inquiry can adequately investigate this.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the Sabbatical Officers, on its behalf, to write to the Home Secretary – simply and concisely - condemning her decision to reject any form of public inquiry into the actions of the police at the Orgreave coking plant on 18th June 1984 during the miners' strike of 1984-5 and calling for her to reconsider
2. To express solidarity with the Orgreave Truth and Justice Campaign and to from now take up all practical opportunities to positively contribute to its work throughout the ongoing struggle for a full public inquiry
3. To mandate the Sabbatical Officers to urge the University to do the same

Proposed: Lucas Bertholdi-Saad (Wadham)

Seconded: Pete Morgan (Wadham)

Lucas Bertholdi-Saad (Wadham) – motion self-explanatory – to send letter to Home Secretary. Have been sending motion out to common rooms. Battle was clash between miners and police during miners' strike in South Yorkshire. Motion goes through issues of clash and why relevant to students as part of solidarity work; should discuss why it's relevant 30 years later. Home Secretary rejected inquiry into Orgreave – became topic because Theresa May's chief of staff said inquiry would be

good idea. IPCC reported excessive violence from police officers, suggested perjury by senior officers, and a cover-up. Police and Crime Commissioner also supported call for inquiry.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – in Resolves 2, “all practical opportunities” – what do you envisage that to mean? Also worried it's not attached to a specific OUSU officer, so likely to get lost. Also unsure exactly what that involves.

Lucas – Wadham SU has also passed similar motion. Passed on to charities rep – interpreted as publicising work of campaign, if petition going round or if campaign wanted to come to Oxford to speak for example.

Tom Turner (St Catherine's) – wondered how many groups or organisations in Oxford will be contributing to campaign in same way you suggest OUSU should do?

Lucas – as many as possible. Can give template motion if you like.

Tim Foot (Merton) – why should students be involved in this campaign?

Lucas – have stated in Believes 1 importance of solidarity between students and trade unions: work very well together historically for same ideals. Also important that miscarriages of justice should affect us as citizens; should motivate us as students.

Connor Broyles (Christ Church) – why does this matter now? Why not wait until political climate has calmed?

Lucas – now currently relevant. In September, Theresa May's chief of staff indicated he would work on this; IPCC cannot start inquiry on own grounds as too much time has passed. Follows on from Hillsborough inquiry, which demonstrates how much can be done on reviewing past police activity. Home Secretary stepped down from request for inquiry, without explaining why.

Zoe Firth (St Hilda's) – do you expect that this may impact on the Sabbatical officers' workload, if there are similar situations to this?

Lucas – hoping there are few instances of this, so hope not. Important issue for students to work on, though. Happy to share draft letter from Wadham.

Tim Foot – what are the ideals we would be standing up for, if we vote in favour?

Lucas – as in Council Believes. Should be an inquiry to investigate this adequately. Police methods require inquiry; current government has similarities to Thatcher's.

Jess Colston (St John's) – don't doubt importance of issue – if had the option, would propose we don't discuss. I'm unsure on St John's students views on the issue, or on trade union links. I don't think OUSU has to be apolitical, but this is one step away from what we should be working on.

Taisie Tsikas (Wadham) – we recently agreed to send money to demo. Often find police violence on similar demos, so commonality between student movement trade unions. Not sure what amendment will say, but in terms of Sabbatical Officer workload, don't see it has to be extensive.

Amendment received

In Resolves 2, add at the start: "To mandate the Sabbatical officers", and add "including by publicising the campaign's work and facilitating their activities where possible."

Proposed: Marina Lambrakis (St John's)

Seconded: Sandy Downs (Corpus)

Taken as friendly; added to motion.

No more debate. Move to vote.

Motion passed. 32 in favour, 4 against, 10 abstentions.

f. Items for Debate

None.

g. Any Other Business

Marina Lambrakis – need graduate Divisional Board representatives in Humanities, Medical Sciences and Mathematical, Physical and Life Sciences (MPLS). Need to have students represented on these committees. Good experience especially for grads; if thinking of academic job, good experience and training on how university works.

Sandy Downs (Corpus) – if anyone upset or nervous as result of United States election result, OUSU, Counselling Service, and Peer Supporters are here.

Appendix 2

Changes to OUSU policy

Council holding the Executive Committee to account (MT14; updated TT16, MT16)

~~OUSU notes that no part of this motion affects the right of any Student Member to bring a motion of censure or No Confidence to Council under any circumstances. OUSU believes that many Sabbatical and Part Time Officers work hard in the interests of students, and that this work should be communicated to students. That a fundamental responsibility of members of the Executive Committee is to report their work to Council. That Council should hold officers who do not report their work to Council to account.~~

OUSU Resolves:

1. To mandate all ~~Sabbatical Trustees~~ ~~Executive Officers~~ ~~[the Sabbatical and Part Time Officers]~~ to:
 - a) Provide a written report to (or where not possible, a verbal report at) and;
 - b) Attend (or where not possible, send apologies for); every Ordinary Meeting of Council.

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

~~1. To mandate all Executive Officers to attend (or where not possible, send apologies for) every meeting of the Executive Committee.~~

~~2. To mandate the President to communicate the list of attendance and apologies to each meeting of Council and of the Executive Committee to the Chair of Scrutiny Committee.~~

~~e) To mandate the Chair of Scrutiny Committee (along with another member of the Scrutiny Committee of the Chair's choosing) to bring to Council a motion of censure against an Executive Officer a Sabbatical Trustee, in the event that the Chair of Scrutiny Committee becomes aware that the member Trustee has failed to fulfil either:~~

~~d) a) b) Both of the mandates in Resolves 1, at two Ordinary Meetings of Council, or;~~

~~e) The mandate in Resolves 3 at two meetings of the Executive Committee.~~

~~4.3. To permit the Chair of Scrutiny Committee to disapply the requirement of Resolves 5 where, in the Chair of Scrutiny Committee's opinion, exceptional circumstances apply that explain the Executive Officer's Sabbatical Trustee's actions.~~

~~5. To mandate the President to ensure any Executive Officer or Divisional Board Representative is notified of:~~

~~a) the existence of this Policy;~~

~~b) how to sign in at meetings of Council and the Executive Committee, and of how to send apologies for these meetings;~~

~~c) how to send reports to meetings of Council;~~

~~d) the consequences of not fulfilling the mandates in this Policy;~~

~~by email to their University email address, and within two weeks of taking office.~~

Amendments to OUSU Bye-Laws

9.6 The Scrutiny Committee has particular responsibility for scrutinising the work of the Sabbatical Trustees. Its members are ~~four~~ two Student Members (other than a member of the Executive).

10.1 Council must hold each Sabbatical Trustee to account, and scrutinise their activities, through (a) questions at Council meetings, and (b) termly reports to Council from the Scrutiny Committee.

10.2 The ~~chair of the~~ Scrutiny Committee may require a Sabbatical Trustee to supply the chair ~~it~~ with such documents as the committee may reasonably require. A document may be edited before submission to ensure confidentiality.

10.3 A Sabbatical Trustee, in consultation with the ~~chair of the~~ Scrutiny Committee, must attend one or more meetings as the committee may reasonably require.

10.4 Council must from time to time provide the Scrutiny Committee with guidance on the exercise of the committee's responsibilities.