

Council Minutes

5th week Trinity Term 2014

5th Week Council took place at 5.30pm on Wednesday 28th May 2014 at St John's College Auditorium.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, please feel free to contact the Chair, Nick Cooper, at chair@ousu.org

- a. Statement from the OUSU President on the NUS Referendum
- b. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
- c. Matters Arising from the Minutes
 1. Meeting between the President and the Chair of Council
- d. Ratifications in Council
- e. Elections in Council
- f. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers
- g. Reports from the Executive Officers who wish to make reports
- h. Questions to Members of the Executive
- i. Passage of Motions *nem con**
- j. Motions of No Confidence or Censure
- k. Motions to amend the Governing Documents
 1. First Reading of Motion to amend General Regulations
 2. First Reading of Motion to amend Election Regulations (Direct Elections)
- l. Emergency Motions
- m. Motions Authorising Capital Expenditure
- n. Other Motions
 3. Advertising ban on LIFE
 4. Bop and Entz Themes
 5. Kebab and Chips
- o. Any Other Business

* Nem con means "without objection". Here, the Chair will read all items under "Other Motions". If you wish to hear a speech in proposition, ask the proposers a question, amend the motion, or speak in opposition, please raise your hand when the motion is called here. **If no one raises their hand, the motion passes without any discussion.**

a. Statement from the OUSU President on the NUS Referendum

Nick Cooper (St John's) - Explained that he was reading out the response received by Junior Tribunal regarding the NUS Referendum, which was passed on to him by Paula Falck, Operations Manager at OUSU and Acting Returning Officer:

1. On 22 May 2014 Jack Matthews submitted a complaint to the Returning Officer concerning the conduct of the Referendum. The substance of his complaint was that the number of voter codes created significantly exceeded the size of the electorate

and that a significant number of spare voter codes were used to vote in the election. Many of these spare codes were used to vote at a similar time and these clusters of votes correlate with cluster of logins from the same IP address.

2. The Returning Officer upheld this complaint. He noted that he had been unaware of the size of the electorate when he created the codes and had issued about 20 spares to voters during the course of the election. He recommended that the matter be referred to Junior Tribunal. Mr Matthews appealed this ruling to Junior Tribunal on 23 May 2014. We have not seen Mr Matthews's appeal to the Junior Tribunal, but we assume that the decision was appealed as the Returning Officer no longer has the power to declare an election void after the declaration of the result (Referendum Election Regulations 24.2).
3. We understand from Paula Falck that the Returning Officer has since resigned. As the governing documents currently prescribe no process for replacing a Returning Officer when s/he resigns, she has taken on the role of acting Returning Officer. Nick Cooper, the current chair of Council and a former Returning Officer was present to assist her. We decided that we were happy for both of them to attend and are very grateful to them for their assistance.
4. We have received a document from Ms Falck showing when each voter code was used and whether or not this was a "spare" voter code. We understand from Ms Falck that the codes marked "spare" are codes which were not originally distributed to voters. Although we understand from Ms Falck that about 20 replacement codes were issued during the course of the election, the number of "spare" codes used to vote far exceeds this. This means that votes were cast using a significant number of codes which were never distributed to voters. On this basis alone the referendum result cannot stand.
5. According we direct the Returning Officer to declare this referendum result void under Schedule 3 of the Referendum Election Regulations 26(e).
6. We note that under Schedule 3 of the Referendum Election Regulations 28(b) we are unable to recommend any changes to OUSU's practices or governance (which must include the governing documents) in our determination of this appeal.

Nick - Informed council that he had an additional note to read out on behalf of Paula Falck:

For clarity, the 'spares' were used as follows:

1097 'spare' UVCs were used to register a vote in the referendum
8 of these were used to register a 'YES' vote
1089 were used to register a 'NO' vote

Tom Rutland (Jesus) - Expressed disappointment and anger that someone has intervened in our democratic processes. Claimed that as it stands, the results are clear, and he will consequently be bringing a motion in 7th week council to re-affiliate with the NUS. Confirmed that he has the support of the leader of the 'NO' campaign regarding this. Stated that the student voice was clear with a 70/30 split in votes in favour of re-affiliation. Informed council that due to the referenda election regulations, there is no time to hold a second referendum before the end of term. Stated that the incoming sabbatical team are welcome to hold one next year, however confirmed that he would not recommend this.

David Townsend (St John's) - Questioned what is currently happening regarding an investigation into what happened and what steps will be taken to prevent it happening in the future?

Tom - Explained that there is an internal investigation happening within OUSU and that a

change in the regulations is being looked into. Stated that a potential change would be to ensure that a staff member of OUSU is present at all times when the UVCs are downloaded and distributed. Added that there is a second investigation taking place from the University point of view which aims to discover who did this and why. Stated that it is essential that we ensure that the elections taking place next term are run in a fair and democratic manner.

David Townsend - Asked when it is expected that the investigations will be completed.

Tom - Responded that any edits to the regulations would come to 7th week council. Stated that the proctors are handling the University investigation so he is unable to comment.

David Bagg (Bailliol) - Asked if OUSU staff are currently carrying out the functions of Returning Officer.

Tom - Responded that this is the case, and explained that this role was handed over to staff when the previous Returning Officer resigned.

David Bagg - Asked why the responsibility was not passed to the Chair of Council.

Tom - Responded that this has been done with the aim of safeguarding students. Also explained that OUSU staff are viewed as impartial and Returning Officer user accounts have had to be suspended. Also added that over a bank holiday weekend, it was easier for staff to arrange a short notice meeting with Junior Tribunal.

b. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Alexander Rankine (Corpus) - Stated that in Motion one of 3rd week Council he had asked if Vulture Magazine was issued once a term, which was incorrectly appears in the minutes as once a month.

Nick Cooper (St John's) - Confirmed that this would be corrected.

c. Matters Arising from the Minutes

a. Meeting between the President and the Chair of Council

Tom Rutland (Jesus) - Explained that a meeting took place between himself and the Chair of Council regarding the requirements of the Trustee Board. Confirmed that they decided in this meeting that the Student Trustees were the most appropriate members of the board to provide a termly report to Council. Added that this would also serve to improve their visibility.

d. Ratifications in Council

e. Elections in Council

Returning Officer - Martine Wauben (Pembroke) nominated. Hust requested.

Martine - Commented that it was an odd week for OUSU RO world. Stated that she was elected two weeks ago as Deputy Returning Officer, and between herself and the other Deputy Returning Officer, Joe Smith, they decided that someone needed to stand and she is able to take this position for the remainder of term. Added that she has experience of working as Returning Officer in the Union.

Martine was elected.

Graduate Welfare Officer - Niina Tamura (St John's) nominated. Hust requested.

Niina - Explained that she is a DPhil student and has done both her undergraduate and Masters degrees here. Stated that she has had considerable involvement with welfare throughout her time at Oxford, including acting as a JCR welfare rep. Added that she is very passionate about welfare, in particular mental health issues.

Esther Kwan (Exeter) - Questioned what her priorities would be at the departmental level.

Niina - Acknowledged that welfare is not great at this level so certainly would look into what can be done to improve.

Niina was elected.

1 Position for Complaints Committee - Adam Roberts (Wadham) was elected.

2 Positions for Steering Committee - Adam Roberts (Wadham) was elected.

Nick Cooper (St John's) - Reminded council that elections for Chair of Council, Returning Officer and Divisional Board Representatives would be taking place in 7th week.

f. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers

Tom Rutland (Jesus) - Informed council that the NUS referendum has taken up much of his time over the previous two weeks, both campaigning and the aftermath. Reiterated how disappointed he was and explained that a lot of time that could have been spent representing students has been wasted. Told council that he attended the Teaching Awards the previous evening and they were excellent. Added that he has also been writing the annual report and working on rent deals. Praised JCR and MCR presidents and stated that they should be really proud of their work on this. Finally advertised the information session on running in statutory elections in Michaelmas, which would be taking place directly after council.

Dan Tomlinson (University) - Informed council that there is good news regarding the RAG Ball as a new venue has now been secured. Also added that much of his time has been taken up by the fact that the University moved forward the discussion on the Living Wage. Confirmed he cannot yet comment on what has been agreed but claimed it looked like good news. Finally, informed council that OUSU's CEO recruitment is ongoing and he has been working on this.

Garlen Lo (Wolfson) - Asked if there were any mature undergraduates in the room, and informed council that a mature students orientation half day has been organised with the provisional date of October 11th. University to fund the event and provide lunch. Reminded council that the International Students' Campaign elections are taking place on the 8th June, with 5 positions available: 2 Chairs, Sponsorship Officer, Treasurer, and Publicity Officer. Urged council to contact either himself or ISCchair@ousu.org if interested.

Charlotte Hendy (Pembroke) - Informed council that she has been continuing to work with Rachel on Suspended Status Students. Updated council that while the University changed their policy to allow all students to have access to facilities and services, there is still work to be done with colleges. Currently preparing for Senior Tutor's Committee taking place in 6th week, where she and Rachel will be asking a paper on this topic. Requested council to provide case studies of both good and bad examples of the experiences of suspended status

students, so that they can display what does and doesn't work.

Rachel Pickering (Hertford) - Informed council that due to a funding uplift, OUSU have been able to recruit a full time member of staff in the position of Academic Representation Officer, who will begin his new role at the start of August. Explained that the intention of this role is to aid students in providing great representation in departments as well as in colleges. Thanked those who had nominated in the Teaching Awards and reported that it was a very special event.

Sarah Pine (Wadham) - Reported that she has been running formal training sessions for facilitators of sexual consent workshops. Informed council that she has also been organizing a white ribbon campaign to remember survivors of sexual violence. Spoke to council about requests to speakers to step down from the Union. Explained that it was connected with the issues of harassment and consent, both of which were on her manifesto, but recognised that this issue has now become very high profile. Informed council that they have previously passed two motions which connect to her aim to boycott the Union. Firstly, in 1st week council Hilary Term 2013, council passed a motion to denounce The Oxford's Union Society's invitation to Julian Assange. Secondly, in 7th week council Hilary Term 2014, council passed a motion in support of an open letter voicing concern that Dr Jeffrey Ketland, the alleged harasser of a student who had taken her own life, remained a University employee and had continued contact with students. Council agreed in these instances that the individuals concerned should not remain in position/be platformed while investigations were ongoing. Sarah informed council that she whole-heartedly supported the notion of innocent until proven guilty, and hoped whole-heartedly that The Oxford Union president is found innocent. Stated that she is happy to take any questions on the matter.

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

Eden Tanner (St John's) - Requested more submissions for the couples and families database which she is working on.

Anna Bazley (St Peter's) - Reported that she will be running a workshop on how to register clubs and societies on Friday. Also informed council that at Clubs Committee, £1,200 was given to two different clubs and encouraged council to apply for money if involved in clubs or societies.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) - Encouraged council to share the event page for a myth-buster session which provides tips for Oxford applicants and answers questions which applicants want to know.

Xav Cohen (Balliol) - Explained that work on Fossil Fuel divestment is continuing and advertised the 'Fossil Free Future Demo' taking place at 11am in Radcliffe Square on Saturday 31st May.

h. Questions to Members of the Executive

i. Passage of Motions *nem con*

j. Motions of No Confidence or Censure

k. Motions to amend the Governing Documents

1. First Reading of Motion to amend General Regulations

Council Notes:

1. Its previous decisions to make Bye-Laws, Election Regulations (for Direct Elections and for Referenda etc.), and General Regulations, all of which are required by the governance arrangements introduced in 2010 when OUSU became an incorporated charity.
2. That Council, Campaigns and the *Oxford Student* are currently governed by older Rules and Standing Orders.
3. The commentary of Internal Affairs Committee (Appendix 1).

Council Believes:

1. That the time has come to replace Rules and Standing Orders with newer-style General Regulations.

Council Resolves:

1. In the exercise of its powers under Bye-Laws 3.1 and 3.2 of the 2012 Bye-Laws, and in accordance with Bye-Laws 4.3, 4.8 and 4.9, to give a **First Reading** to the proposal now before Council to amend General Regulations 2014 (Appendix 2).

Proposed: Tom Rutland (Jesus)

Seconded: Alfred Burton (Queen's)

Tom Rutland (Jesus) - Explained that OUSU governing documents are currently spread over a mess of both regulations and standing orders. Informed council that the aim of the motion is to make them all General Regulations, so we have one complete set of comprehensible documents. Reported that the regulations do not include any significant changes and are primarily the moving over of standing orders and the slight editing of wording for purposes of clarity. A few additional changes included permitting visiting students to attend and speak at council and moving the deadline for Steering Committee due to time issues.

Motion passed with no opposition.

2. First Reading of Motion to amend Election Regulations (Direct Elections)

Council Notes:

1. Its previous decisions to make Bye-Laws, Election Regulations (for Direct Elections and for Referenda etc.), and General Regulations, all of which are required by the governance arrangements introduced in 2010 when OUSU became an incorporated charity.
2. The reports of the Electoral Review Group and the Returning Officer made to 5th Week Council, Hilary Term 2014.
3. The commentary of Internal Affairs Committee (Appendix 1).

Council Believes:

1. That elections should be fairly and properly conducted.

Council Resolves:

1. In the exercise of its powers under Bye-Laws 3.3 and 3.4 of the 2012 Bye-Laws, and in accordance with Bye-Laws 4.3, 4.10 and 4.11, to give a **First Reading** to the proposal now before Council to amend Election Regulations (Direct Elections) 2013 (Appendix 3).

Proposed: Tom Rutland (Jesus)

Seconded: Alfred Burton (Queen's)

Tom Rutland (Jesus) - Explained that the proposed amendments have been considered by the Electoral Review Group, the Internal Affairs Committee, and have had involvement from council throughout. Reported that the primary changes include: reducing the eligibility of Junior Tribunal to add an additional year that they must have been out of University; amending the NUS delegates to fit with the new requirement that at least three of them are women; reducing the number able to run on a slate for NUS delegates and allowing flexibility to the RO to invalidate nominations retrospectively where it is clear that the candidate was ineligible.

David Townsend (St John's) - Questioned if the maximum number of NUS delegates on a slate is being increased to 4 or 5.

Tom - Replied that it is being reduced from 5 to 4, with no more than 3 people who are not women.

Nick Cooper (St John's) - Asked if there was any opposition to the motion.

David Bagg (Balliol) - Opposed motion. Explained that he was RO in 2012 and has also been involved in several electoral review groups. Believed that while some of the changes were positive ones, some of them were bad. Stated decreasing the number that can run on a slate was bad, as it reduces the choice of people to elect, and reduces the number of those involved in the process. Accepted that the change to 22.1 regarding gender balancing was necessitated by changes. Criticised the change to regulation 33.4 as the electoral system is not defined, and argued that this is a real problem as candidates will require this information before they run. Stated that regulation 23.8 was highly worrying as the Returning Officer has the potential to bend the rules. Accepted that 26.3 is a good change however requires some finessing. Claimed that Schedule 2, paragraph 11b was unnecessary.

Daniel Turner (Balliol) - Asked if the changes need to pass this week or in 7th week.

Nick - Responded that they need to pass in both.

Tom - Added that all suggestions have come through a long process of discussion. Reminded council that reducing the number of delegates was proposed by them and explained that regarding the voting system, we are awaiting information on the best practice recommended by NUS Wales who already have gender balancing for delegates in place. Informed that reg 23.8 allows the RO to invalidate retrospectively which may be required at times, and 27.4/28.1 allows flexibility as the media changes from year to year.

Dan Tomlinson (University) - Asked how many times these changes have come before council.

Nick - Reported that following the ERG report, they came before council a further 2 times.

Dan - Suggested that council have had a long time to respond with any queries.

Nick - Responded that he couldn't comment.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) - Suggested that the main problem with the NUS is that people do not recognise what it does. Proposed that it might be an idea to separate out the elections for NUS delegates so students understand that they are separate from OUSU.

Sarah Pine (Wadham) - Stated she is in favour of narrowing the slate from 5 to 4, as it may encourage people to be more selective in terms of who runs, and also adds further simplicity to the process.

Will Obeney (Regent's) - Stated that although this has been agreed and supported by council, it

often has been the last item on the agenda, at which point people have either left or want to leave.

David Bagg - Insisted that leaving discretion to the RO is very unsafe. Also pointed out to council that these regulations can be reviewed each year to ensure that they are up to date, so why not have something in place with regards to media. Urged council to look at the issue of NUS delegates from the point of view of those voting, not those running.

Dan - Move to vote.

David Bagg - Opposed.

Dan - Argued that we have heard both sides, the information has already been presented to council and made available on the OUSU website, and we have sufficient knowledge to vote.

David Bagg - Claimed that there was more to be heard from both sides, and the changes have not been seen sufficiently by all students. Urged council to spend more time on this.

Vote on move to vote

Move to vote - summary speeches.

Tom - Waived summary speech.

David Bagg - Claimed that there are important reasons to not pass these regulations now, as the philosophy should be to make them work for all the students which we represent. Urged that council back the ordinary student and reject these regulations.

Vote

In favour - 40

Against - 18

Abstain - 11

Motion passes.

David Bagg - Requested numbers.

Nick - Confirmed numbers.

l. Emergency Motions

m. Motions authorising Capital Expenditure

n. Other Motions

3. Advertising ban on LIFE

Council Notes:

1. That 1 in 3 women in the UK will have an abortion. (British Pregnancy Advisory Service).
2. That many Oxford students will have had an abortion or will choose to have one whilst being a student.
3. That OUSU has pro-choice policy, maintaining a stance that the best person to make decisions around pregnancy is the person themselves.

Council Believes:

1. Pregnant people deserve impartial and non-directional information and advice.
2. That the best person to make decisions around pregnancy is the pregnant person themselves.
3. That LIFE's counselling and publicity is directive.
4. That LIFE claims "you can take the time, with our support, to work through all your options and discover what is best for you " whilst still being against abortion in all circumstances.
5. The organisations that give misleading advice can be actively harmful.
6. that anti-choice messages can be triggering and harmful for people that have chosen to terminate a pregnancy.

Council Resolves:

1. To instigate and maintain an advertising ban on LIFE and other organisations which provide directional abortion advice.
2. Never to platform any group or organisation which provides directional advice around abortion or explicitly stands against women's right to choose.
3. To provide students with information about impartial, non directional pregnancy and abortion advice providers
4. To make all of Council Notes and Believes, and Council Resolves 1-3 Council Policy.

Proposed: Sarah Pine (Wadham)

Seconded: Alasdair Lennon (St John's)

Ali Lennon (St John's) - Summarised that the purpose of this motion is to send students to people that can provide them with non-directional advice.

Amendment received:

In 'Council Resolves 2' to replace the word 'platform' with 'promote'.

Proposed: Sarah Pine (Wadham)

Seconded: Barnaby Raine (Wadham)

Sarah Pine (Wadham) - Accepted amendment as friendly.

Molly Gurdon (Christ Church) - Questioned the meaning of the amendment.

Sarah - Explained that banning promotion means that OUSU would not advertise LIFE or publicise their views on their website etc.

David Bagg (Balliol) - Asked if groups at Oxford that are part of a religious group, or Oxford LIFE, for example, could have a stand at Freshers' Fair.

Sarah - Responded that resolves 1 which refers to providing directional advice covers this. Does not believe that this motion would affect religious groups. Stated that LIFE falls under standing against a woman's right to choose.

David Lawrence (Jesus) - Asked if LIFE could attend Freshers' Fair if this motion was passed.

Ali - Responded that they could not.

Simon Posner (Pembroke) - Asked why the motion is necessary if OUSU do not currently promote LIFE.

Sarah - Explained that we have policy in place against promoting LIFE which is due to lapse.

St John's student - Asked who defines 'directional'.

Ali - Stated that the LIFE mission statement is clearly directional.

Megan - Asked if it then the proposers who are defining directional.

Sarah - Informed council that the OUSU definition of directional comes from the Student Advice Service.

Maria Gabriel (Herford) - Asked if the motion would cover bpas.

Sarah - Responded that bpas is not directional.

Alexander Rankine (Corpus) - Asked what is new to the policy and what is renewed.

Sarah - Answered that Notes 1-3 are new; Believes 4 and 6 are new; Believes 2 is edited and Resolves 4 is new. Added that even those that are new are largely the same with re-phrasing.

Hannah Gardner (University) - Argued that it appears that the ban is solely on those who are pro-life, or those that include people who are pro-life.

Sarah - Suggested that Hannah could propose an amendment to clarify.

Paddy Ferguson (Mansfield) - Asked if the implication is that this advice is harmful.

Sarah - Responded that it is, as people should have the right to make their own choices without receiving advice which tells them what to do.

Dan Tomlinson (University) - Requested clarification on the difference between promote and platform.

Sarah - Responded that to platform is to put in the public domain while to promote is to advertise positively.

Dan Hitchins (Wolfson) - Stated that the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy (BACP) lists LIFE as a non-directional organisation. Questioned what qualifications the Student Advice Service has which overrides this.

Sarah - Listed qualifications of advisors and explained that we link up to Advice UK.

Nick Cooper (St John's) - Move to debate on amendment.

Barnaby Raine (Wadham) - Claimed that Freshers' Fair has Pro LIFE, OUCA, Labour etc. Stated that there is a difference between this and using OUSU to advertise.

Dan Hitchins (Wolfson) - Argued that the amendment is merely window dressing on the policy. Insisted that there is now confusion as we previously heard the proposers state that LIFE would not be welcome at Freshers' Fair.

Sarah - Responded that she is willing to retract on that comment, and LIFE may have a table at Freshers' Fair with this motion.

Amendment changed:

In 'Council Resolves 2', to replace 'promote' with 'give money, formal support or official endorsement'.

Proposed: Sarah Pine (Wadham)

Seconded: Barnaby Raine (Wadham)

Nick - Asked if there was any objection on new amendment.

Objection raised - debate on amendment.

Peter Elliot (St John's) - Asked if OUSU currently give money to or promote LIFE.

Sarah - No

David Townsend (St John's) - Asked if with the amendment, advertising LIFE would now be fine.

Barnaby - No.

Dan Hutchins - Stated that this is now effectively a motion to do nothing as OUSU does not currently hand out money or advertise LIFE.

Louis Trup (Brasenose) - Explained that if this motion passes, they will have a stall at Freshers' Fair. Added that the motion needs the amendment to avoid a dangerous precedent.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) - Move to vote on amendment.

Objection.

Annie - Reminded council that there are other motions to get through and we are simply re-hashing what has already been said.

Simon - Stated that it is very likely that with a rejected amendment the motion will not pass.

Vote on move to vote.

Move to vote.

Vote on amendment:

For - 43

Against - 6

Abstain - 11

Amendment passed.

New amendment received:

To remove 'Council Resolves 2'.

Proposed: Dan Tomlinson (University)

Seconded: David Bagg (Balliol)

Dan - Stated that the amendment is very confusing even amongst those that are proposing it. Stated that it is not in the original policy and he feels very uncomfortable about it.

Sarah - Responded that this is not accepted as friendly.

Nick - Ruled that speeches should last only one minute.

Opposed.

Vote on Chair's ruling - passed.

Ali - Encouraged council to vote on the substance of the motion and see what people think. Argued that we shouldn't get hung up on procedure.

Anya Metzger (Wadham) - Move to vote.

Opposed.

Anya - Informed council that no more information could affect her decision, as enough ground has been covered in debate.

Vote on move to vote - passed.

Vote on amendment:

For - 27

Against - 24

Abstain - 8

Amendment passed.

Move to vote on motion called.

Opposition.

Sarah - Argued that everyone will already be decided on how they are going to vote.

Josephine Jackson (St Edmund's) - Argued that LIFE do not have a voice here to defend themselves so motion should not be passed. Added that BACP have given them credit as a non-directional service.

Vote on move to vote:

For - 48

Against - 9

Move to vote passed.

Sarah - Insisted that no service should provide directional advice, and it is clearly evident on their website that LIFE do this.

Dan Hitchins (Wolfson) - Reminded council that LIFE are not present and need a voice in order to be banned. Asked how we can justify overruling the BACP, which is a body set up by the Government's Department of Health.

Vote:

For - 35

Against - 16

Abstain - 12

Motion passed as amended.

4. Bop and Entz Themes

Council Believes:

1. That welfare concerns should influence the choice of entz themes.
2. That the role of a bop is to bring a college together and for its members to enjoy themselves in a safe environment.
3. That entz with themes that have large scope for offence, such as Bad Taste Bops, are a welfare issue because:
 - a) The publicity and the event itself can be highly offensive to students;
 - b) Highly sexualised themes can be potentially distressing to survivors of abuse.
4. That entz with highly gendered themes are a welfare issue because:
 - a) there is usually an implicit or explicit gender divide, and for anyone who does not identify with traditional gender roles this may be problematic.
 - b) Often such themes give a role usually seen as superior or more powerful to men, and a submissive, inferior role is given to women.
 - c) Often such themes will stereotype men and women in a highly objectified and/ or sexualised role (e.g. vicars and tarts, pimps and hoes, 'fox hunts').
 - d) 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.
5. That the above problems might cause many people to be uncomfortable attending bops, which should be as inclusive as possible.
6. 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.
4. To make all of Council Believes and Council Resolves 1-3 Council policy.

Proposed: Sarah Pine (Wadham)

Seconded: Rowan Davis (Wadham)

Sarah Pine (Wadham) - Explained that she has discussed this motion with the VP Welfare and Equal Opps. Claimed that the motion speaks for itself. Informed council that it already exists as policy and is about to lapse. Urged council to keep Oxford safe and vote.

Will Obeney (Regent's) - Asked the view of the wider welfare wing of OUSU.

Charlotte Hendy (Pembroke) - Confirmed that she fully supported the motion.

Josh Platt (Hertford) - Questioned if this would not be dealt with internally by colleges and asked who is doing the contacting.

Sarah - VP Women, VP Welfare and Equal Opps, Graduate Women's Officer, Women's Campaign Officer and Health and Welfare Officer.

David Townsend (St John's) - Asked if it correct that OUSU's role in this would only to provide a listening and advising service.

Sarah - Confirmed that is correct.

Jamie Wells (Corpus) - Stated that we cannot command but can advise and have done so on previous occasions.

Alexander Rankine (Corpus) - Suggested that we amend the motion to affirm the rights of JCRs and MCRs to choose their own bop themes.

Amendment received:

To insert 'Council Believes 7' - 'That JCRs and MCRs can choose their own Bop and Entz themes.'

Proposed: Sarah Pine (Wadham)

Seconded: Alexander Rankine (Corpus)

Sarah - Accepted amendment as friendly.

Motion passed with one abstention.

5. Kebab and Chips

Council Notes:

1. That Hassan's, Ahmed's, Hussain's, Adam's and other fine portable vendors of greasy culinary treats are considered by many of the student body to form an essential part of Oxford life
2. That far more insightful political debate happens in a Hassan's queue than in OUSU Council
3. That it's Fifth Week and we're all bored shitless and/or terrified about exams
4. That not enough realistic, achievable and serious motions are put to Council and this motion rectifies that
5. To mandate the President-Elect to eat two portions of cheesy chips a week for his entire term of office
6. That proposers of motions shouldn't put points in 'Council notes' that should really go in 'Council resolves'
7. Chips

Council Believes:

1. That a clear OUSU policy on kebab vans would fix OUSU's image problems and make it directly relevant to student life
2. That OUSU is best positioned to destroy the capitalist mode of production and abolish the state
3. That nationalising kebab vans would protect them from difficult economic times, ensure workers were in control of their labour, and ensure a steady and even expanded supply of fast food for the Oxford student body
4. That Council should be opposed in principle to three things, misused commas, irony and irrelevant lists.
5. That the time will come when hobbits will shape the fortunes of all.

Council Resolves:

1. To adopt forthwith a policy of nationalising Hassan's under workers' control (along with other Oxford kebab vans)
2. To commit to the forced collectivisation of Andrew Hamilton's estimated £434k salary, which would buy every Oxford student roughly six kebab van meals a year
3. To prevent the need for further boring passing of motions, investigate the practicalities of a policy of simultaneously condemning and supporting everything, indefinitely

4. To campaign for cheesy chips, falafels, kebabs and burgers free at the point of use for all students
5. Chips
6. To make Council Resolves 1-5 Council Policy

Proposed: Nathan Akehurst (Lincoln)
Seconded: James Elliott (St Edmund's)

Motion deferred to 7th Week Council.

o. Any Other Business

Appendix 1 - Commentary on Proposed Changes to Governing Documents

This commentary is an attempt to elucidate for Council members and for interested students the substantive changes to OUSU's Governing Documents proposed for consideration by Council today. These documents have been considered at length by Council's Internal Affairs Committee, composed of Nick Cooper (Chair), Tom Rutland (OUSU President, *ex officio*), Alfred Burton, Anna Bradshaw and James Blythe. This commentary is necessarily subjective - it is our attempt to indicate the changes we think are important. The updated Governing Documents, once in force, will be the sole authoritative text. Current documents are available on the OUSU website, for comparison.

General Regulations

- Council, Campaigns and the *Oxford Student* newspaper are currently covered in older governing documents called the Rules and Standing Orders. These proposals are to translate these documents - with few substantive changes - into new-style General Regulations, which fit with the remainder of OUSU's Governing Documents. The substance of the governing documents can then be reviewed later.
- Some minor substantive changes have been made from the Rules and Standing Orders to ensure the documents fit with current practice and policy. These changes are:
 - Permitting "visiting students" to attend and speak at Council
 - Moving deadline for Steering Committee meeting to Friday 12pm
 - Clerical changes to remove ambiguities, accidental omissions and Latin phrases
- A motion in 7th week will propose repealing all remaining Rules and Standing Orders.

Election Regulations (Direct Elections)

Council set up an Electoral Review Group following the MT13 Statutory Elections, to review the Election Regulations. The Group's recommendations have now been translated into proposed amendments. The Group consulted Council throughout on proposed amendments, and it is hoped that the proposed amendments will be acceptable. Furthermore, NUS Conference introduced a new requirement meaning that from next year, at least three of OUSU's Delegates to NUS Conference must be women. The main amendments are as follows:

- Amending eligibility for Junior Tribunal to reflect current practice (Regulation 10.2)
- NUS Delegates: Amending the maximum number on a slate (now four); introducing a requirement that no more than 3 may be people who are not women (Regulation 22.1); amending the voting system for their election, to one approved by Elections Committee and Council to meet the requirements of e.g. the NUS (Regulation 33.4)
- Permitting the Returning Officer [RO] to invalidate nominations retrospectively where it is clear the Candidate was ineligible (Regulation 23.8)

- A new rule preventing acquiring campaign material below cost price (Regulation 26.3)
- Mandating the RO to make Directions on media and websites (Regulations 27.4/28.1)
- Making a breach of an RO's Direction an *Election Offence* (Sch 2, Paragraph 2b)
- Amending the procedure for complaints made by members of Elections Committee, to ensure fairness. These are now heard at first instance by Junior Tribunal (Sch 2, Paragraph 11b)
- Allowing discretion if a complaint decision cannot be made in 24 hours (Sch 2, Paragraph 29a)
- Amending which remedies are available to the RO/Junior Tribunal in different circumstances, and permitting a stay where, for example, an appeal is ongoing (Sch 2, Paragraphs 38-42)