a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Minutes passed

c. Ratifications in Council

1. Motion proposing further support of the Orchid Project and Daughters of Eve

WomCam notes:
1. The unique work of the Orchid Project as the only organisation dedicated solely to ending Female Genital Cutting (FGC).
2. The complementary importance of Daughters of Eve in working with young people in the UK both to prevent and to rehabilitate.

WomCam believes:
1. That FGC is physically and psychologically damaging
2. That we should support organisations working to prevent, end and deal with the consequences of FGC.

WomCam resolves:
1. To publicise the Orchid Project and Daughters of Eve using all the means available to us
2. To ask Common Room Women’s Officers and Women’s Campaign members to submit charity motions to their Common Rooms, asking for donations to the Orchid Project and Daughters of Eve.

Proposed: Nicola Sugden (Balliol)
Seconded: Tania Beard (St Antony’s)

Nicola Sugden (Balliol)
The way Autonomous Campaign works we can pass policies, which council can adopt by Ratifying. We would had some visitors from a charity that want to stop genital mutilation, new projects which are desperate for funding we have decided to support them through advertising.

Ratified
2. **OUSU Women’s Campaign and Political Marches**

**WomCam notes:**
1. That political marches are an important exercise of the right to protest

**WomCam believes:**
1. That political marches and protests have the power to raise awareness of important issues and change the way people think about them, as well as to encourage activism on those issues by reinforcing solidarity amongst similar-minded individuals and groups

**WomCam resolves:**
1. To support the following marches (as well as any others which are in line with policy passed by OUSU Council or WomCam) wherever possible by organising a group to attend:
   a. Reclaim the Night
   b. Right to Choose
   c. Slutwalk
2. To organise and promote sister marches in Oxford whenever this is feasible
3. To take a WomCam banner when we march.

**Proposed: Nicola Sugden (Balliol)**

**Seconded: Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)**

Nicola Sugden (Balliol)
Slightly more controversial, WomCam has a history of participating in marches, and decided we support slutwalks, so will attempt to hold sister marches in Oxford and will attend one’s in London.

Chris Gray (St Cross)
I don’t support right to walk.

Motion ratified

3. **The impact of cuts to the welfare state and the restructuring public services on women**

**WomCam notes:**
1. The cuts to and restructuring of the budgets of public services occurring under the Comprehensive Spending Review and subsequent government budgets.
2. The cuts to and restructuring of the welfare system occurring under the Comprehensive Spending Review and subsequent government budgets.
3. That research by the House of Commons Library found that 72 per cent of the savings identified in the budget will come from women’s pockets
4. The Fawcett Society’s warning that women now face the “triple jeopardy of benefit cuts, job losses and looming ‘care gap’”
5. That the future of specific local services such as the Oxford Sexual Abuse and Rape Crisis centre, local youth services, and libraries are in doubt due to cuts and restructuring.
6. The work of the Oxfordshire Anti-Cuts Alliance and Oxford Save our Services in fighting for services invaluable to the local community.

**WomCam believes:**
1. That cuts and restructuring are currently leading, and will in the future further lead, to reductions in the extent and effectiveness of public services and welfare structures which have served directly (and indirectly) to improve gender equality and women’s quality of life, and that that this is a bad thing.
2. That as well as being members of Oxford University, we are residents of the City of Oxford, and that we have an obligation to promote the wellbeing of the wider Oxford community.
WomCam Resolves:
1. To support anti-cuts action locally by sending a message of support to the Oxfordshire Anti-Cuts Alliance and Oxford Save Our Services and informing our members of their anti-cuts action so that they can choose to get involved.
2. To organize for the Women’s Campaign to march under our banner at local and national anti-cuts demonstrations wherever possible.
3. To take a motion to OUSU Council proposing to set up an OUSU Anti-Cuts Campaign, with a view to commit and coordinate student activists to work with the Oxfordshire Anti-Cuts Alliance and Oxford Save Our Services

Proposed: Nicola Sugden
Seconded: Katharine Terrell

Nicola Sugden (Balliol)
Most controversial at WomCam we decided that in terms of Government spending two debates, feel should have been a gender neutral report put in place, so we object to cuts. The resolves is to support the local campaigns, offering to support them properly would be supporting them with leafleting.

SFQ
Would you be taking part in the marches under guise of the part on gender?

Nicola Sugden (Balliol)
We can’t decide specifically what the message of the march is, so want to raise profile of march.

Are you asking to support WomCam, or take what have said and say on behalf of OUSU?

Nicola Sugden (Balliol)
Asking you to join us in supporting these campaigns.

Speech in Opposition

Jack Matthews (St Peters)
Don’t think passing is good idea. I’m not student for student, but think there are people who are better at campaigning for this than we are we should be more involved in the Higher Education cuts rather than just cuts. I think also starts to make us sound as if we are against all cuts, need to be specific. OUSU has trod a good line on keeping all political sectors within the student body involved, like Conservatives like me. Can’t amend, so think should vote down and people should be pointed in right direction.

Nicola Sugden (Balliol)
Specificity would take on board, this doesn’t propose an anti cuts campaign. Supporting locally is supporting anti cuts, by pointing in right direction. This motion doesn’t say support all cuts just cuts locally.

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Take point that not students for students, there are students who use NUS, who are parents, we shouldn’t be narrow, should keep in context.

David Barclay (Worcester)
Support Jack and think WomCam should have policy, are concerned would be leaving students behind if took a specific anticuts stance. Fantastic womCam have and support, but not a statement that I am happy to support, local anticuts group in its entirety.

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Women are disproportionately affected by these cuts, so are LGBTQ and SWD students. Even if motion objected by Council will still be WomCam’s policy, don’t want to have policy which goes against OUSU policy.
Jack Matthews (St Peter’s)
If does fail won’t be contra to WomCam, OUSU just won’t have policy, should be no fight. They are autonomous, won’t be opposing policy.

Move to Vote

Speech in Proposition

Nicola Sugden (Balliol)
Think really good recognise our place as part of community. If students want to support, then OUSU should support to.

Jack Matthews (St Peter’s)
Should keep everyone within OUSU bubble, WomCam should come back with another motion to create bridges between OUSU and individuals in these campaigns’.

Ratification Falls

17 For
24 Against

d. Elections in Council

The following position was elected in OUSU Council of 5th week.

1 position for Humanities Undergraduate Divisional Board Representative - responsible for representing their peers directly to the heads of faculties and division. Serve until end of TT11.

Ugo Okoraofor (St Hilda’s)
Hi everyone just one position uncontested, unless anyone wants hust am going to move to vote. Michael Bimmler not in attendance. Please fill out voting slips and hand to me or Daniel Lowe

If anyone wants online voting in your colleges, then please talk to me and I will set it up for you.

Michael Bimmler elected

e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers

David Barclay – President
Direct mandate from last council, update on No Confidence, kicked off in a big way in press. Campaign in Warwick and Cambridge, spreading and capturing press attention. Focus on next Tuesday would be a shame if not much of a turn out from tutors please speak to your tutors. If you have a tute or lecture that would clash with them attending then please move. You could email them to rearrange and advise them to attend congregation. You could go to the website. I am still collecting peoples opinions, please send 50 words or less on why you do or don’t have confidence in the governments policy. I am trying to get a live link to the debate, think would also be good for students to be there before they vote, if interested please get in touch with me and will organise.

Tom Perry – VP Welfare & Equal Opportunities
For those reading agenda, Nami had to unexpectedly go back to Japan, would like to thank. If you are interested in running please contact me.

Katharine Terrell – VP Women
Tania Beard comes to end of term at the end of this term will be vacancy there.
Daniel Lowe – VP Charities & Community
RAG does comedy actually tomorrow.

f. Reports from the Executive Officers who wish to make reports

Jacob Diggle – Clubs & Societies Officer
Held clubs council, about what issues they want help. Had a good response, will submit report in 7th week. 12 societies setting up this week. Currently have over 600 in Oxford at this time. Working closely with Colin Jackson on International Students, working out how can integrate them into clubs and societies seen.

Sarah Santosham – Community Outreach and Charities Officer
Last workshop next week, practical application of community organising. Going to be run by David and Sophie Stevens. Living wage been doing loads of work to bring together a community action next week. Can’t tell you anything but email me.

Katie Collier – LGBTQ Officer
Trying to push through a motion in common rooms that pushes through genderless to make trans people more comfortable. Shouldn’t be controversial will just make trans people more comfortable.

David Bowe – Graduate Welfare Officer
Going to take forward welfare provision in college lock down periods. If anyone knows anyone who would be interested in my role please contact.

Colin Jackson – International Students Officer
Made mistake no written report in on time. Wanted to briefly let you know what doing in contact with the Domestic Bursar about providing storage for International students. Had 28 responses, but the information I received didn’t provide that much information about what facility they had. Will be contacting you and your international officers.

Announcement from Scrutiny Committee

Jack Matthews (St Peter’s)
Scrutiny happening at the moment, please email me with your views on Exec, as it is really helpful, both positive and negative things.

One measure during your time to make your position more sustainable, in terms of greenness. I will send exact wording around Exec.

i. Passage of Motions Nem Con

1. Advertising Ban on LIFE
   Opposition

2. Referendum Proposal
   Opposition

ii. Motions affecting OUSU members as students at Oxford University

3. Improving Teaching at Oxford

Council Notes:
1. That the University set up a Review of its Teaching Model in early 2010 designed to "define and review the way that we teach in relation to our educational objectives, and consider how the academic priorities of the collegiate University can be accommodated in the light of the financial position prevailing."
2. That this review is ongoing, with Departments and the University’s Academic Divisions conducting a large data collection exercise to discover details relating to Oxford’s current teaching provision.

3. That OUSU conducted a major consultation of undergraduate students in Trinity Term 2010 resulting in a report being produced which described the undergraduate experience of Oxford teaching (this report can be found at [http://www.ousu.org/about/Teaching%20Review%20Report.pdf/view](http://www.ousu.org/about/Teaching%20Review%20Report.pdf/view)).

4. That following on from the success of this exercise the current VP (Graduates) and Graduate Academic Affairs Officer have recently completed a consultation of students on Taught Masters programs and that this report is appended to this motion.

5. That major findings from this consultation include issues related to feedback provided to Taught Masters (PGT) students, variability of provision between tutors, course administration, and the objectives of certain PGT programs.

6. That far more detail on all of these points (and many more) can be found in the actual Teaching Review Report for PGT students appended to this motion.

7. That the initial setting up of the University’s Teaching Review included a request that guidance be developed "on the expectations that are appropriate for a taught postgraduate course" and that "It is important to be able to demonstrate how excellence in teaching is delivered across Oxford".

8. That Departments are currently considering the data which has been collected on teaching provision across Oxford and how best they could make use of available teaching resources in delivering future academic provision.

Council Believes:
1. That the consultations conducted for both the OUSU Undergraduate and PGT Teaching Review submissions have led to the development of valuable information about the experience of students on their courses and what their objectives for their time at Oxford are.

2. That further discussions with students at course and departmental level will be valuable to ensure that the conclusions of the OUSU Teaching Review project are taken forward in conjunction with the University’s Review of its Teaching Model.

3. That teaching provision should be shaped around the reasonable expectations of students.

4. That further work remains to be done on improving the academic provision offered to students on undergraduate and postgraduate courses.

5. That the University should take this work forward without undue delay as a result of the clear evidence base indicating measures which could be undertaken to improve academic provision at Oxford.

Council Resolves:
1. To accept the Report into the experience of PGT students at Oxford (appended to this motion)

2. To mandate the OUSU Executive to take forward the findings of the two reports in undergraduate and PGT provision in conjunction - where appropriate - with colleges, Departments and the Academic Divisions of the University.

3. To mandate the OUSU Executive to work with Common Room, Divisional and departmental representatives on improving academic provision at Oxford in line with the findings outlined in both the undergraduate and PGT reports.

4. To recommend to Departments the methodology used in collating student views within the Teaching Review project - that of face-to-face, student-led discussions in a format similar to "Academic Feedback Sessions" which are currently used in a wide range of colleges across Oxford.

Proposed: Jonny Medland (Wolfson)
Seconded: Beth Evans (Wadham)

Passed Nem Con
4. **Motion to Establish a Review of OUSU Postgraduate Representation Structures**

Amended

5. **First Public Examinations (FPE) Resits**

**Council notes that:**
1. There is significant divergence among undergraduate programmes as to the format for FPEs and the regulations governing resits.
2. Currently 9 courses utilise Honour Moderations (double blind-marking, leads to a classification); 4 courses use Moderations (normally single-marked, no classification); 26 subjects utilise Preliminary examinations (ostensibly the same as Mods).
3. The current timing of resits for students failing Trinity Term FPEs makes it difficult for students who fail resits to gain places on courses at other institutions without being forced to defer for another year, and that the proximity to the start of term has a negative impact upon the welfare of those students who are resitting and causes administrative problems for colleges.
4. There is significant inequality in the way students’ results are measured and utilised by colleges and student progression in their course, with some colleges setting pass-marks well above the University’s own requirements and refusing students the option of resitting the FPE.
5. There is a lack of consensus across the University regarding the purpose of the FPE and what it means for a student to pass the FPE, both at the first attempt and at resit. The meaning of the FPE does not currently take into consideration that people reading a second degree need not take the FPE and can progress directly to the Final Honours School.

**Council further notes that:**
1. A working group (which is attended by the VP (Access & Academic Affairs)) in the University has been considering issues surrounding the FPE over the last 18 months and has made preliminary recommendations on changes to the FPE.
2. There are outstanding issues regarding several aspects of the FPE that have been referred back to the group for further work.

**Council believes that:**
1. The purpose of the First Public Examination should be to gauge whether a student has the requisite study skills and/or basic knowledge to be able to continue their degree beyond the FPE, as identified by their department(s) or course co-ordinators. This is what a ‘bare-pass’ at FPE should signify, either at resit or first attempt. It should not be used as a signifier of potential FHS outcomes or as a test of the ability to cope with the intensity of Oxford examinations.
2. All FPE examination types should be consolidated with the use of a ‘Prelim’ across all subjects at the FPE stage (resits and original examinations) with a common pass-mark becoming the standard.
3. All students who fail the FPE at the first attempt should have the opportunity to resit the FPE on at least one occasion, and that applications for further attempts to resit may be submitted to the University’s Education Committee.
4. There should be the same number of resit papers as in the original examination and these should follow the same format of the papers failed and should be both set and examined with the same academic rigour.
5. The processes for adjustments and consideration of special circumstances should be the same for resits as for the original FPE examination.
6. The timing of FPE resits should be common across all subjects and resits for students failing the FPE during Trinity Term should take place so as to allow results to be available by mid-September.
7. That a candidate who passes 50% or more of the FPE at the first attempt need only resit the papers that s/he failed, whereas a candidate who passes less than 50% of the FPE at first attempt should resit all papers.
8. Failure to meet a college-specified pass-mark above the standard University pass-mark for the FPE should not in and of itself lead to the termination of a student’s course of study, nor should it prevent them from resitting the FPE on one further occasion if the failure is the candidate’s first attempt at the FPE. Colleges may though consider performance in the FPE and resits when monitoring the academic performance of its students. In effect, a college should not use FPE or FPE resits as a penal collection within its academic disciplinary processes.
Council resolves to:
1. Mandate the VP (Access & Academic Affairs) to communicate Council’s beliefs to the University and colleges, in particular the University’s working group on the FPE.
2. Mandate the VP (Access & Academic Affairs) to work with JCR representatives to lobby colleges to support the beliefs expressed by Council.

**Proposed: Alex Bulfin (Univ)**
**Seconded: Chris O’Connor (St Benet’s)**

Passed Nem Con

6. **Accommodation**
   Opposition

7. **Bop and entz themes**
   Opposition

8. **Motion to Establish an OUSU Review of University-wide Academic Representative Structures (Late addition to Agenda)**
   Amendment

9. **NUS Affiliation Motion**
   Amendment

iv. **Motions affecting OUSU members as residents of Oxford**

10. **Student Housing**

Council Notes;
2. That a public consultation on the above document will begin sometime in June 2011 and last for 6 weeks.
3. That the University and its Colleges are only granted planning permission for new builds where they can demonstrate that the number of University students ‘living out’ is less than 3000.
4. That many Colleges are currently unable to provide accommodation for all students, and therefore some students have to ‘live out’.

Council Further Notes;
1. That part of the Council’s preferred proposal on student accommodation aims to “…direct student accommodation away from residential areas and towards areas that are generally busy…”
2. That the preferred proposal on Houses in Multiple Occupation (e.g. houses of those ‘living out’) is to restrict their number. This is proposed to be enforced by only granting planning permission to build/convert a dwelling to a HMO if the proportion of HMO’s “within 100 metres of street length either side of the property does not exceed 20%.”

Council Believes;
1. That students are members of the Oxford City community, and deserve to be treated as such.
2. That the preferred proposals will restrict the University and it’s Colleges ability to construct new student accommodation
3. That the preferred proposals will restrict students ability to find accommodation should they decide to ‘live out’.
4. That the proposals within Oxford City Council’s Sites and Housing Development Plan will severely affect students accessibility to affordable accommodation, both within the University, Colleges and the private sector.
5. That the City Council’s plan to restrict the construction of new student accommodation is incompatible with its plan to reduce the number of students ‘living out’.
6. That it is important for there to be a student response to this consultation.

**Council Resolves;**
1. To mandate the President and the VP (Charities and Community), and other appropriate members of the Executive, to submit a reply to the consultation on behalf of students.
2. To mandate the President, in their weekly email, to make students aware of the consultation, the affects of the proposals, and how they can respond, both directly and through OUSU.
3. To mandate the Executive to liaise with the University of Oxford, it’s Colleges and Oxford Brookes University in their response to the consultation, as appropriate.

*Proposed: Jack Matthews, St. Peter’s College  
Seconded: David Railton, Somerville College*

**Passes**

6.1. **Motions affecting OUSU members as citizens of the world**

**11. Women’s pay**

**Council Notes:**
1. The gender pay gap for all employees is currently 19.8% (source: Office for National Statistics.)

**Council Believes:**
1. That men and women should be paid equally for doing equivalent work
2. That the gender pay gap is exacerbated by the undervaluing of low-paid jobs traditionally employing more women, for instance care work.
3. That the current gender pay gap is unjustifiable.
4. That more should be done to provide equal pay for comparable work to properly reward the hard work done in undervalued jobs, and to make higher-paying jobs accessible to women.

**Council Resolves:**
1. To organise an awareness raising event and a petition, letter writing campaign or similar campaigning event every year until the gender pay gap is rectified to mark Women’s No Pay Day.
2. To ask Varsity Entz to consider a reduction in women’s admission at any event organised on the day concerned to raise awareness of this problem.

*Proposed: Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)  
Seconded: David Barclay (Worcester)*

**Passes**

**n. Other Motions**

6.1. **Motions affecting OUSU members as OUSU members**

**1. Advertising Ban on LIFE**

**Council Notes:**
1. Council’s Pro-Choice policy (TT05; renewed TT09),
2. That within this policy, council resolved to oppose moves to restrict the current legal situation.
3. The Women’s Campaign’s policy against LIFE

**Council Further notes:**
1. That LIFE is openly anti-abortion
2. That LIFE openly states that “it is always wrong to intentionally take the life” of a fetus
Council Further notes:
1. There is a LIFE office in Oxford.

Council Believes:
1. That pregnant people deserve impartial and non-directional information and advice.
2. That LIFE’s counselling and publicity is directive.
3. That LIFE claims to “help you decide what’s best for you” despite being against abortion in all circumstances.
4. That organisations that give misleading advice can be actively harmful.
5. That this is an important issue for students as around 10% of women aged 20-24 and 6% of those under 20 will fall pregnant.

Council Resolves:
1. To instigate and maintain an advertising ban on LIFE and other organisations which provide directional abortion advice.
2. To support students in proposing advertising bans against directive organisations to their common rooms.
3. To encourage students to be vigilant against the advertising of directive organisations such as LIFE in their common rooms and faculties by reiterating OUSU’s policy and directing students’ concerned about such advertising to OUSU’s women’s officers and welfare team.
4. To provide students with information about impartial, non-directional pregnancy and abortion advice providers.

Proposed: Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Seconded: Beth Evans (Wadham)

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Once of the most important services we offer is student advice service, prides it self on being free, impartial. It is non directional, not about judgements about talking to them and explore what they think about issues, what they believe and then making that decision. Life is a service which targets women who become pregnant, they claim they are impartial. What they do is tell you exactly what your baby looks like it talks about it as a person. Don’t want any women to hear when in vulnerable position, or any student to hear. Deserve impartial information, the facts, health advice support, about having an abortion, not being judged or pushing in a certain direction. Life are against abortion in any circumstance, even at the risk of the health of the mother. Don’t want them to have access to our students in anyway.

Organisation called abortion rights, which would make them put false advertising on information.

What the ban would entail?
Anything that OUSU produces.

Question: Mansfield
Have they approached?

Previously yes.

Josh Coulson (St Edmund’s)
Motion about anti abortion or not?

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
We recently had a motion supporting abortion rights, and we also have Prochoice policy.
Opposition.

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Think said everything

Jonathan Hinder (Merton)
Think inherently contradictory to say have impartial advise. Our stance is essential prochoice, not sure what should be doing. Don’t think should deny other people the opportunity to put there opinion across. I am pro choice, think we are pretending to be neutral.

David Bowe (Somerville)
In promoting neutrality, we are not allowing advertising space to someone who offers specific advise. We don’t want false advertising, which may negatively effect those that follow it. In opposing a directive organisation, is preventing a falsely advertised view point being proposed.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmund’s)
If produce a commercial product and someone comes to harm from following that advice. If life go insolvent wish they could, then potentially we could end up with large amounts of liability. The liability could run to millions of pounds.

Move to vote

Proposition

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
I don’t think we should allow life to advertise when they claim to be something that there not. People will not expect to be guilt tripped by an impartial advice service.

Way worded are saying impartial. We are not neutral from a pro choice stance.

Motion passes clear majority.

2. Referendum Proposal

Whereas:
1. Changes to OUSU’s Standing Orders require approval at a First Reading and a Second Reading in order to become effective.
2. Possible changes to the OUSU’s Standing Orders relating to elections will be considered at Termly Council in 7th Week, but the proposal changes have already been distributed to members of Council via e-mail. Approval of any or all of these proposed changes at Termly Council in 7th Week would function as a First Reading for such changes to the Standing Orders.
3. A referendum of all OUSU members can function as a Second Reading. A referendum can be held if approved by Council and at least 14 days’ notice is issued of the pending referendum.
4. Such a referendum can function as a Second Reading for changes to Standing Orders.

Now THEREFORE this Council does resolve
1. To hold a referendum in 8th Week of this Trinity Term 2011 on the question ‘Do you approve of the changes to OUSUs Standing Orders passed in Termly Council in 7th Week of Trinity Term 2011?’, such a referendum to function as a Second Reading for any such changes.
**Proposed by: David J. Townsend, St John’s College**  
**Seconded by: Loren Parry, St John’s College**

David J Townsend (St John’s College)  
Hi everyone, I am David was on Electoral review, goal was to increase the turnout of elections, as miserably low 15%. Interim report last term, if we are going to change anything, we need to make changes this term. First reading in termly council, and then a second reading as a referendum in 8th week, which throws out to whole student body. No crazy proposals out there. This is the limit of all that will be proposed. Point is for debate to happen in 7th week, then anything council does vote on will go to people in 8th week.

David Railton (Somerville)  
Will there be a quorum in the referendum?

David J Townsend (St John’s College)  
No

Will you accept as typo, as it has to go to termly council?

Point of Information

Jonny Medland (Wolfson)  
No matter what we end up doing. We can’t change as it is banned in 7th week, ambiguous whether can happen in termly.

Claire Barnett (Oriel)  
Will this be an online vote, or a debate?

Chair  
Will be an online vote.

Jim O’Connell (Univ)  
If there is a referendum, there is a no and a yes campaign and they would go into OxStu.

POI  
Can we move this to end of the proceedings. So that the answers can be located.

No opposition moved to end.

**RETURN AT END OF OTHER MOTIONS:**

Jack Matthews would like to advise wrong.

SFQ’s

Eleanor Brown (St Hugh’s)  
How is this affected if the standing order is changed?

Whatever termly council passes will go through to referenda.

St Catherine’s
What is guarantee that people will vote on, is there any point in running. First Point of debate.

David J Townsend (St John's)
One of the problems is driving higher turnout. Final approval is opened to people of OUSU. Some technical but are actually simple to explain.

If we put out massively technical document will disillusion people.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmund's)
Think it really bad to have a referenda. We don't know what the proposed changes will be. If you want to propose a yes campaign or no campaign, you will only have a few days. No chance for central hustings. We don't have a debate, unless have Friday of 8th week no way to do properly. Don't think best way to engage people. We debated mailing lists for 10 mins but reason not longer, was massively controversial. Just don't think that all these things are that simple. Not the way to engage people. There is away of amending standing orders, can do Special Council in MT12. If we force things through changes in Trinity term it often means we have to unpick it. These things won't come into effect until at least 3rd week, because that's when a committee occurs.

Alex Bulfin (Univ)
Not way I would choose to pass. Tehre are really important changes that we should pass. Shouldn't leave till MT as will through candidates into chaos. If don't like we won't pass in 7th week. Go ahead and read. Might pass something illegal and if we do they will be caught. Not how I would choose but think important that we do.

Jack Evans (Corpus Christi)
Echo Alex, but like to make cautionary tale please go away and read, and disemminate it as much as you can. Ensure you stand up if you think need to be amended. Make sure do all debate that is necessary.

David J Townsend (St John's)
Think we shouldn't risk making the perfect enemy of the good. Referenda not perfect but think we should do it. I think argument of University signing of isn't a problem. The questions that crazy should come up, is not possible deadline is Monday of 6th week. No last minute crazy changes. Lets do something not nothing.

Opposition

Daniel Lowe (St Edmund's)
Let people run a yes and no campaign, when they are not dealing with end of term stuff. Lets make sure that this highly blunt question is given an appropriate answer. All the problems that people are worried about happen because people don't attend the RO's briefing. Think going to end badly.

28 For
10 against

Motion Passes

ii. Motions affecting OUSU members as students at Oxford University

3. Improving Teaching at Oxford

4. Motion to Establish a Review of OUSU Postgraduate Representation Structures (Correctly amended motion)

OUSU Council notes that;
1. 40% of Oxford Students are Postgraduates
2. OUSU’s primary function is to represent all students, including postgraduates.
3. Postgraduate attendance at OUSU council is negligible.
4. The Postgraduate Assembly is defunct.
5. Postgraduate turn out for OUSU elections, including those in council, is very low.
6. Current OUSU structures of Postgraduate representation fail to engage Postgraduates. OUSU Council believes;
7. These failings are so serious that establishing effective postgraduate representation must now be a priority for OUSU and is an issue that must be resolved urgently.
8. The most effective way to begin this process is to implement a review of the existing postgraduate representation structures and systems immediately.
9. This review should consider the views of a diverse range of postgraduates across the university.

**OUSU Council resolves;**
1. A review of OUSU postgraduate representation should be established immediately.
2. This review should be run by a committee which will include representatives from MCRs and division representatives.
3. The VP Graduates should sit on this committee and co-operate with it to the best of their ability. The VP Grads (Elect) should sit on this committee and have observer status at the end.
4. The committee will be free to invite, where necessary, other members of the student body to take part in the review.
5. The committee should actively gather and incorporate postgraduate views and feedback on current and proposed OUSU postgraduate representation structures.
6. The committee should look to actively engage Post Graduates in OUSU and other representative structures across the University.
7. That Chris Gray (Merton) shall Chair the Review Committee

*Proposer: Christopher Gray (Merton)  
Seconder: David Townsend (St Johns)*

Chair – Adam Tyndall
Amendments taken 6 & 7 accepted as friendly. Amend council resolves 3. All accepted as friendly.

Christopher Gray (Merton)
Plan is to set up a review of Postgraduate engagement, has already been passed at PresCom. Big part role of PresCom and the fact that normally postgrads don’t turn up to OUSU council. Find out what the malaise is, crucial that OUSU should support and be involved, but should be run by postgrads. The final aims are to bring on wider postgrads and more mcr’s presidents. To create a policy document, about how see being supported by OUSU. Some sort of charter. 3rd and most important will be process itself engaging in dialogue. Think can work. To sum up fundamental point, is to say it is there Union as much as everyone else. How want OUSU to represent and serve them.

Amended motion passes.

Jim O’Connell (Univ)
Reason why I added amendments, OUSU has had loads of reviews, and then whatever comes back disappears into either. Want it to be an active campaign, and find solutions were committee finds issues. Want VP grads elects to sit on it, should be measure of continuity.

5. **First Public Examinations (FPE) Resits**

6. **Accommodation**

**Council Notes:**
1. That few colleges offer single-sex accommodation.
2. WomCam’s policy for single-sex accommodation.

**Council Believes:**
1. That for religious, cultural or personal reasons, some students may wish to live in single-sex accommodation.
2. That students should have the option of living in single-sex accommodation regardless of which college they apply to or are accepted by.

**Council Resolves:**
1. To recommend that colleges and the university provide single-sex accommodation, for example by organising a single-sex staircases, floors or bathrooms.
2. To recommend that colleges, as part of their room allocation process for all students living in, ask students whether they would prefer to be in mixed or single-sex accommodation.
3. To regularly make JCR/MCR/SU Presidents and Women’s/Women’s Welfare Officers aware of this policy and ask them to consider implementing it in their own colleges.

**Proposed: Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)  
Seconded: Nicola Sugden (Balliol)**

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
I think access is really important, so do you probably, lots of reasons people decide to take up a place and an accommodation. Women can’t pick on whether they could get single sex accommodation. Might just be a question and setting aside one corridor solely for women. Fairly uncontroversial one just for men, one for women.

Not all male students can apply to St Benets.

Sebastian Fivaz (Christ Church)
Would you consider a room with a bathroom as single sex. Which don’t offer single sex.

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
About suggesting way to do it. Don’t think bathrooms are only issue, such as sharing cooking and living space. Haven’t gone through all 38 colleges and found out. This is about colleges just thinking about it, colleges can make up their own mind.

Ed Watson (Oriel)
Does appear that one thing about coming to university is stepping outside comfort zone.

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
I was single sex accommodation and I think I turned out ago. Think colleges can figure out, this isn’t a sweeping reform. Different cultural needs, think people should be allowed to have their preference. Firstly think some colleges might do this, this is the spirit of the motion. Not about being inconsiderate it may just not have crossed their minds.

Question: How many cases have you come across requesting this?

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
We don’t get people before they come here. There are people that would like it but can’t advise as it is confidential.

Chris Smith (Keble)
Think we should make clear that we are passing a stronger view. Think people might feel like being troublemakers, way of making process easier.

Chris Smith (Keble)
Passed motion saying Rent too Damn High, think that this may result in a fall in occupancy, and may lead to a price increase. Think there are problems, and may get more complicated than think.
David Bowe (Somerville)
By encouraging colleges to offer this option, should ask them to think about how they will achieve.

If expecting colleges to offer, they will have to back up with what has been offered. They cannot back down.

David Barclay (Worcester)
We are recommending, don’t see why can’t offer as a matter of routine. Very complicated lots of tensions not harmful to through another in.

Katie Collier
Capacity and rent, this happens anyway, could ensure specifically one gender and people wouldn’t notice.

Colin Jackson
Colleges have no problem telling people what they cannot have in their room.

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
This is uncontroversial just asking a question. Just asking them nicely to consider.

Sebastian Fivaz (Christ Church)
Don’t think a problem, might cause problems.

Move to vote.

Motion passes by overwhelming majority.

7. **Bop and entz themes**

**Council Notes:**
1. 1 in 7 women will be seriously sexually and/or physically assaulted during their time at university.
2. Most common rooms will have members who identify as trans or gender queer, even if other students are not aware of this.
3. Just under 50% of trans-identified people will attempt suicide in their lifetimes.

**Council Believes:**
1. That welfare concerns should influence the choice of entz themes. That the role of a bop is to bring a college together and for its members to enjoy themselves in a safe environment.
2. That entz with themes that have large scope for offence, such as Bad Taste Bops, are a welfare issue because:
   i. the publicity and the event itself can be highly offensive to students;
   ii. Highly sexualised themes can be potentially distressing to survivors of abuse.
3. That entz with highly gendered themes are a welfare issue because:
   i. there is usually an implicit or explicit gender divide, and for anyone who does not identify with traditional gender roles this may be problematic.
   ii. Often such themes give a role usually seen as superior or more powerful to men, and a submissive, inferior role is given to women.
   iii. Often such themes will stereotype men and women in a highly objectified and/or sexualised role (e.g. vicars and tarts, pimps and whores, 'fox hunts').
   iv. Entz events which encourage “cross-dressing” or experimenting with gender presentation can be unintentionally upsetting to trans-identified students and students who do not identify with traditional gender roles, but may have the potential also to be a friendly environment if dealt with sensitively.

4. That the above problems might cause many people to be uncomfortable attending bops, which should be as inclusive as possible.
5. That many bop themes are possible and do exist that do not run into these problems.
Council Resolves:
1. To regularly contact JCR/MCR/SU Welfare Officers, Equal Opportunities Officers, Women’s Officers, LGBTQ officers and Entz Officers raising the above concerns.
2. To encourage the reporting to common room or OUSU welfare teams of bop themes which have been considered to be in bad taste or which have left any individual offended, upset or otherwise made to feel uncomfortable in attending.
3. To mandate the VP (Welfare and Equal Opportunities) to include in Freshers’ Week training information and advice on inclusive entz themes.

Proposed: Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Seconded: Katie Colliver (Univ)

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Bops are fun, entz are fun, should be a fun way to get a college together. Have been a number of incidents when there have been horrific and nasty bop themes, I hope in past. Our image is pretty bad anyway, the daily mail loves stories about it. Is a serious issue, lots of women, lots of trans people, lots of people who don’t want to be made fun of. Don’t think blacking up is cool, lets be nice not nasty.

SFQ

Some people have a different gender identity to that which was assigned to them at birth. People might not be out. Cross dressing can be done sensitively talk to LGBTQ officer or Welfare Officer, instead of excluding good to include.

Claire Barnett (Oriel)
Is this gender based?

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Pretty much everything, just raising awareness of bops, just think a case of checking at the beginning.

John Wilson (Merton)
What does it do?

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Can’t mandate JCR’s. Mandates Tom to put this in training he does for Freshers’ Week to make people think about the welfare connotations.

Steve Dempsey (Balliol)
Where does it put Wadhams Queer Bop?

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Think fantastic, especially if taking into account people want to enjoy themselves. If someone is doing something in a way which clearly makes fun of someone. Not against cross dressing.

Opposition.

Steve Dempsey (Balliol)
No problem with principle, there is a fine line between people celebrating a quality, shouldn’t we leave to the JCR Presidents.

David Bowe (Somerville)
The whole point is to introduce sensitivity. Just asking people to consider factors, OUSU provides trainging to raise awareness of issues that arise. These are bad things, might be a good idea to consider these things. Not prescriptive just helpful useful service.
Nicola Sugden
Fine line between liberating and sensitive. Good idea to provide more training, some people who may be unhappy with Bop themes are often vulnerable.

Jim O’Connell (Univ)
Safari party, some people blacked up damaged our college and damaged ourselves.

Sebastian Fivaz (Christ Church)
Think it is a badly worded motion, should be a shorter motion, better worded. OUSU officers should give advise.

Move to vote

Jonny Medland (Wolfson)
Lots of points made.

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda’s)
Lets be nice to each other.

Comment: I’m not sure we need an OUSU motion not to tell us to black up.

Passes with an overwhelming majority.

8. Motion to Establish an OUSU Review of University-wide Academic Representative Structures (Late addition to Agenda) (Correctly amended motion)

Council notes:
1. Postgraduate representation structures are not standardized across the University
2. Postgraduate academic representation structures in some areas of the University are non-existent and/or ineffective in gathering postgraduate feedback and acting on it
3. OUSU Council elects Divisional Representatives
4. There is no established framework of how the Divisional Representatives and Course Representatives should operate and liaise
5. In the OUSU standing Orders neither the VP Graduates nor the VP Academic Affairs are give the responsibility of liaising with, and co-ordinating, Divisional Representatives

Council believes:
1. OUSU is responsible for the effective and coherent operation of Postgraduate academic representation across the University
2. That within OUSU, this should be the responsibility of the VP Academic Affairs together, alongside the VP Graduates
3. Divisional Representatives are a powerful resource for postgraduate academic representation and for OUSU which are currently not utilised effectively
4. The main cause of this is the lack of established institutional structures, including role descriptions, communications protocols and hierarchies
5. It is urgent and imperative that these issues are dealt with immediately

Council resolves:
1. To establish a review of the Academic Representation structure and functionality and OUSU’s role within it
2. To mandate a committee to run this review with the ultimate goal of designing an achievable and effective Postgraduate Academic Representative structure, standardized across the University. The committee will include Divisional Representatives, the VP Graduates, the VP Academic Affairs and the Graduate Academic Affairs officer. The VP Graduates (elect) should sit on this committee and have observer status at the end.
3. The recommendations of this committee will be brought to OUSU council to be discussed and approved. Those recommendations, which are approved, will be implemented by OUSU and the Postgraduate division representatives to the best of the ability.
4. To mandate the Committee to engage Post Graduates in Academic Representation across the University.

**Proposer: Francesco Fermani (Merton)**
**Seconder: Nathan Levin (St Cross)**

Chair – Adam Tyndall
Amendments. Firstly the amendment on green slip. As friendly.
2 further amendments to council resolves 2. VP grad accepted as friendly.

Francesco Fermani (Merton)
Brief, it is intrinsic that postgrads most affiliated with department. We need a structure to engage within divisions with departments. We don't even have a counterpart to PresCom. We need to form a network of postgrad representation. We are working on this as divisional board representatives, so that we know what is there, can design with students an academic side, to bring together representation and students that are isolated. We cannot leave too much this structure to people. We need job descriptions, so that people are aware of what is there role. Also bringing to council, so that they can contribute ideas. We need OUSU to facilitate this structure once it is in place. We need Executive to help maintain and run smoothly. OUSU itself is designed for undergraduate, for postgrads needs to be redesigned.

St Catherine’s
Is it looking at restructuring something that already exists?

Francesco Fermani (Merton)
It is about ensuring that people are identified. So that if here about new funding or restructuring of admission, have someone to tell creating a network.

Motion passes.

iii. **Motions affecting OUSU members as members of the student movement**

9. **NUS Affiliation Motion**

**Council notes:**
1. OUSU’s affiliation to the National Union of Students is about to lapse.

**Council believes:**
1. That students are stronger when they join together to speak with one voice and engage in collective action.
2. That the NUS provides valuable services such as training for OUSU sabbatical officers.
3. That OUSU should continue to engage in the national student movement.

Council resolves:
1. To renew OUSU’s affiliation to the NUS
2. To debate OUSU’s affiliation to the NUS not later than Trinity Term 2012.

**Proposed by: David Barclay (Worcester College)**
**Seconded by: Alex Bulfin (University College)**

Chair – Adam Tyndall Advises Friendly amendment council believes 4.

David Barclay (Worcester College)
Very simple so won’t take too much time, talked about Exec, about elections in NUS, and council thought should explore elections on one member one vote.

SFQ
York union have moved to disaffiliate.
Jack Matthews (St Peter’s)
This is a vote if, we will affiliate now but may reconsider if you don’t change.

David Barclay (Worcester)
Delegates vote in elections.

Jack Matthews (St Peter’s)
We also have concerns with their minuting
If we have concerns now, then why don’t we disaffiliate now?

David Barclay (Worcester)
We gain more from being a member, just several things want to change.
Costs £10,000 every year.
Some colleges have passed motions about the cuts.

Jack Matthews (St Peter’s)
Think should reaffiliate, represent nationally can’t reform from the outside. New representatives coming on board who might change it. Can always disaffiliate next year.

No opposition. Motion passes.

**o. AOB**

Congratulations. In 25 mins there will be Pizza going to have 5 min break and then will have event for people who might be interested in running in OUSU elections.