

Council Minutes

7th Week Hilary Term 2016

7th Week Council took place on Wednesday 2nd March 2016, at St Antony's College, Blue Boar Lecture Theatre.

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 on 01865 611831, or at dso@ousu.ox.ac.uk.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, please feel free to contact the Chair, Marina Lambrakis, at chair@ousu.ox.ac.uk.

- a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
- b. Matters Arising from the Minutes
- c. Ratifications in Council
- d. Elections in Council
- e. Reports from and questions to the Sabbatical Officers, Executive Officers, Divisional Board Representatives, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (*Raise and Give*)
- f. Emergency motions
 1. Prevent Strategy Motion
- g. Passage of motions without discussion
- h. Motions of No Confidence or censure
 2. Motion to Censure Against Hayley Han (Divisional Board Rep for Postgraduate Social Sciences)
 3. Motion to Censure Against Holly Roy (Student Parents and Carers Officer)
- i. Motions to amend Bye-Laws, General Regulations or Election Regulation
 4. New Bye-Laws
- j. Motions authorising expenditure
 5. Good Night Out (GNO) Oxford requests £250 to allow training in order to go into clubs to further efforts to raise awareness and change handling of harassment around Oxford
 6. Welfare for Welfare
- k. Other motions
 7. Motion to Accept the Hilary Term 2016 Scrutiny Report
 8. Evaluating carbon exposure in the University's endowment
 9. Support for #ShutDownYarlsWood and Shutting Down All Other Immigration Detention Centres
 10. Trans Full Time Officer Motion to NUS
 11. One Member One Vote at the NUS
- l. Any other business

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

No issues were raised.

b. Matters Arising from the Minutes

No matters arising from the minutes.

c. Ratifications in Council

No ratifications in Council.

d. Elections in Council

Chair of Council – Matthew Collyer (New) nominated.

No hust requested.

Matthew – 44

RON – 1

Abstentions - 1

Mathew Collyer was elected.

Returning Officer – Anna Mowbray (New) nominated.

No hust requested.

Anna – 43

RON – 1

Abstentions - 1

Anna Mowbray was elected.

Womens' Campaign Officer – Tuesday Doherty (Worcester) nominated.

Hust requested.

Tuesday – Informed council that she has third year free after her Mods for Classics, and would like to devote that time to energising the campaign and facilitating all the amazing events that go on. Said that she is currently Womens' Welfare Officer at Worcester, is peer support trained, has participated in mental health crisis training, so would be able to add a welfare aspect to WomCam. Added that she is currently Bi/Pan rep and Co-Chair of the Disability working group of the LGBTQ campaign, and Chair of the Bye Bi Prejudice campaign, and is consequently able to coordinate between activism and social events. Acknowledged that it is very important to work with as many groups as possible, and stated that she would work on intersection. Noted that the theme within WomCam is 'The state kills women', which she would like to build upon by bringing in speakers to talk about the prison industrial complex, and the intersection of that with disability activism. Concluded that she wants to work with other campaign groups, and recognises that she is not directly affected by every issue which affects people, so will ensure people who are better suited to do so speak on these.

Tuesday – 42

RON – 1

Abstentions – 3

Tuesday Doherty was elected.

MPLS Undergraduate Divisional Board Representative – Jack Langley (LMH) nominated.

No hust requested.

Jack – 42

RON – 1

Abstentions – 3

Jack Langley was elected.

Steering Committee – Matthew Collyer (New) nominated.

Ali Lennon – Informed council that this nomination was withdrawn as Matthew had been elected Chair of council and was therefore an ex-officio member of Steering Committee.

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

Cat Jones (Pembroke) – Updated council that her recent priority has been her work on suspended status students, and that last week she successfully lobbied Senior Tutors' Committee to devote a special strategic meeting in week nine, entirely devoted to discussion on suspended status. Reported that access to the meeting has been restricted to senior tutors only, so she will not be able to attend, however has produced a briefing note for them based on the survey produced for suspended status students earlier in the term.

Becky Howe (Pembroke) – Reported that she has completed one of her pledges with the Oxford Students Festival, which was a really great day attended by both students and members of the local community. Updated that her other main project is the welfare survey, which has just hit 3400 responses, which is the highest that OUSU has ever had, and they will be contacting colleges letting them know how they are doing in terms of their responses.

Ali Lennon (St John's) – Reported that the last week has been dominated by work on Prevent, with a fantastic information session the previous evening with Lord Macdonald and Catherine Paxton, and a planned first meeting of the Preventing Prevent group at OUSU taking place next week. Informed council that the rest of his time has been spent working on some newly received information that NHS Thames Valley have published guidelines for college GPs which allow for the breach of medical confidentiality, meaning that they can tell parents about the illness of a student without their permission, should they have sufficient concern. Reported that this is a great concern to him, is a degradation of the privacy of students and has the potential to be very harmful, particularly if it deters students from approaching their doctor. Stated that he rang up the person responsible today and spoke to their PA and demanded a meeting, he will be pursuing a complaint with the Care Quality Commission over lack of consultation, and he will be writing to the College Doctors Association to ask them to have student confidentiality protected.

Lucy Delaney (Wadham) – Reported that she and Becky has started work on the NUS Lad Culture

Audit, and met with them last week to start making plans for next term.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Reported that he has been setting up focus groups for masters students and has done eight so far, has another five in the diary and is hoping for a few more. Noted that the feedback is demonstrating key problems with masters courses which are repeated across the board, which he will be taking to the University next term. Added that he is also writing a response to a consultation on the graduate supervision system, which is a termly monitoring system for graduate students which does not work very well. Urged graduate students to fill in, promote and circulate the welfare survey, as currently their participation is very poor, and encouraged students to nominate in the OUSU Student Led Teaching Awards.

Emily Silcock (New) – Informed council that her time has been spent primarily on RAG, reporting that a new committee has been elected, and the RAG charity ballot is currently open, and will be counted tomorrow. Added that she has also been running clear outs, and has a student rep working on this in every undergrad common room except Pembroke, and has some but not all of grad common rooms. Urged graduate and Pembroke students to get in touch about this. Reported that on Friday she will be concluding her eight-week campaigning for change course, with a session teaching people about campaigning through micro actions across lots of different Oxford-based charities.

Dorkina Myrick (Mansfield) – Referred to Ali's update that college doctors will be allowed to contact the parents of students if there is an issue of concern, and stated that the only concern she can think of is that there is a mental issue where they have expressed that they are going to harm themselves or someone else. Questioned what is meant by concerns.

Ali – Replied that in his understanding it goes further than that. Noted that at this stage all he knows is what he has read in The Times, and from that he understands that this applies under-25s who are at the University and have a college doctor. Informed council that if these students become depressed or ill, or if the doctor has concerns, then their parents may be contacted and informed of their health conditions, which is immensely worrying, as not everyone has a great relationship with their parents, and it has the potential to dissuade students from going to the doctors.

Matthew Collyer (New) – Asked Ali if he has considered writing to the BMA about this.

Ali – Replied that he has not thought of this yet, but asked to speak to council about the suggestion after the meeting.

Kelly (St John's) – Asked if doctors notify their patients before informing the parents.

Ali – Replied that he does not yet have all of the necessary information.

Jane Yu (Oriol) – Asked Becky how much the festival cost in total, and how many students got involved in OUSU and participating societies.

Becky – Replied that evaluation work is still ongoing, adding that the budget will go into her next report. Noted that she could not be sure about attendance numbers, as the festival went on all day. Explained that there was positive feedback from those who attended, and she will be writing up how it could be made better for next year.

Cat – Reported that Quality Assurance is happening next week, and they are short of a couple of students in particular categories which the panel would like to meet, one of which is an MPLS undergraduate, and one of which is an undergraduate or PGT student who has done Springboard.

Urged students who fall into either of these categories to get in touch.

Dan Mead (St John's) – Reminded all members of the Part-Time Executive to submit reports to OUSU council.

f. Emergency motions

1. Prevent Strategy Motion

Council Notes:

1. That the current mandates are becoming difficult to manage with the developments in the OUSU Prevent strategy.
2. That several motions have been passed to clarify our position. These have been written in coordination with CRAE (Campaign for Racial Awareness and Equality) and the BME & Anti-Racism Officer.
3. Circumstances have changed and new information has come to light on how we can protect students and limit the implementation process.

Council Believes:

1. The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 (CSTA) and PREVENT Duty should be repealed/removed.
2. That we should do all we can to limit the harm caused by racism and Islamophobia.
3. That this legislation and this duty pose a risk to the rights and welfare of many of our student members.
4. That OUSU Officers should take measures to protect the welfare and rights of students.

Council Resolves:

1. To repeal the 'Clarification of Preventing Prevent Motion'
2. To condemn the CSTA 2015 and the Prevent Duty.
3. To mandate OUSU Officers to do all they can to limit the degradation of student rights and wellbeing prior to the implementation.
4. To mandate all OUSU Officers to explain their objections to the CSTA 2015 and the Prevent Duty at every meeting they attend on which Prevent is on the agenda.
5. To mandate the VP (Welfare & Equal Opportunities) to inform Common Rooms on how they can best protect the rights and welfare of their members.
6. To mandate all OUSU Officers to not assist with the fulfilment of any PREVENT or CSTA 2015 Obligation.
7. To mandate all OUSU Officers to raise concerns about student welfare and rights that are affected by the PREVENT Duty via the appropriate channels within the University of Oxford
8. To mandate the VP (Welfare & Equal Opportunities) to launch the Preventing Prevent Group before the end of HT 16.

Proposed: Ali Lennon (St John's)

Seconded: Hilal Yazan (St Hugh's)

Ali – Reported that in light of new information, he has made the decision, along with the Campaign for Racial Equality (CRAE) and the BME Officer, that the existing policy on Prevent needs altering, in order to make some serious impact on limiting the implementation and how far it can go. Noted that they are particularly keen to push an agenda of unconscious bias training, as well as being eager to

limit some key figures in colleges, who are a real source of anxiety, and have the potential to be discriminatory and islamophobic to students.

Kevin (Merton) – Asked what the new information was.

Ali – Answered that there is new information regarding how far colleges have to go in relation to training and monitoring, as well as finding out that a lot more can be done to support and protect students, which helped feed into the presentation the previous evening. Updated council that at the meeting last night, they provided common room presidents with the goals that OUSU plan to pursue, which are lobby colleges for a free speech and rights commitment statement to be published; lobby for the OUSU-approved training course; lobby for the OUSU-preferred risk assessment and lobby for the OUSU-preferred action plan. Offered to circulate documents if people wish to see them.

Motion passed with no opposition.

g. Passage of motions without discussion

8. Evaluating carbon exposure in the University's endowment

Council Notes:

1. The Fossil Free campaign has widespread support within Oxford University and worldwide. In the UK alone, 17 universities and 39 other organisations, including the British Medical Association, have committed to full or partial divestment from the fossil fuel industry.
2. Since Oxford University Fossil Free was launched in October 2013, 41 college common rooms, representing over 12,500 students, have passed divestment motions; 109 academics have expressed written support; fossil free petitions have been signed by 870 alumni and over 2,500 others. In February 2016, over 300 academics from Oxford and Cambridge signed a letter calling on their universities to stop investing in fossil fuels and pursue more 'morally sound' investment policies.
3. Oxford University Fossil Free worked through the University's Socially Responsible Investment Review Committee to challenge Oxford University's investment in the fossil fuel industry, and to call on the University to make the following commitments on ethical and financial grounds:
 - a. Systematically evaluate carbon risk across the entire investment portfolio;
 - b. Actively manage the carbon risk exposure of its portfolio with the aim of steadily shifting investments away from high-risk, carbon-intensive assets and toward low-carbon opportunities;
 - c. Remove from its portfolio all direct investments in coal and tar sands oil assets as soon as possible;
 - d. Develop a strategy to effectively engage with policy-makers, financial regulators and corporate management, notably by becoming a member of the Institutional Investors' Group on Climate Change (IIGCC).
4. In May 2015, Oxford University Council responded to the campaign with a statement that included the following:

- a. A commitment to continue to avoid direct investments in the coal and tar sands oil industries, in line with their policy to avoid investments that pose the ‘highest social and environmental risk’. Thus the University has recognised the social and environmental implications of its investment portfolio.
 - b. A breakdown of the University’s endowment investments in the fossil fuel industry, as of 31 December 2014: an estimated 3 per cent exposure to the wider energy sector; 1.7 per cent in exploration and extraction, 0.2 per cent in refining and marketing, 0.4 per cent in storage and transportation and 0.7 per cent in equipment and services.
 - c. A commitment to include in the annual report of Oxford University Endowment Management (OUem) “a full breakdown of all sector exposures.”
 - d. That Oxford University are ‘world leaders in the fight against climate change’, with ‘ambitious sustainability targets’, and that OUem already has ‘robust mechanisms to ensure environmental and social factors are properly considered’ in its investments.
 - e. That University Council supports ‘a broad range of energy investments’ as part of a ‘balanced investment policy’.
 - f. That “As a member [of the Institutional Investors’ Group on Climate Change] OUem also has access to the latest research on monitoring carbon exposure in investments.”
5. While it was confirmed that, prior to the consultation, OUem had already met two recommendations of the Fossil Free campaign listed above (Notes 3c. and 3d.), the Council statement did not:
- a) Address the other two recommendations (Notes 3a. and 3b.). These were the recommendations that required OUem to change their investment policy.
 - b) Present an evaluation of carbon exposure in their investment portfolio (see Notes 4f.).
6. This statement was met with displeasure from students, academics and alumni. As a direct response, 68 alumni handed back degrees and a group occupied a university building.

Council Believes:

1. The University’s current commitments as laid out in the Council statement are inconsistent, in particular because:
 - a. The proportion of the endowment invested indirectly in the fossil fuel industry is in line with the national average¹, suggesting that - contrary to the Council statement - the University’s commitment to a ‘balanced’ investment policy is neither ‘ambitious’ nor ‘world leading’ (see Notes 4d.);
 - b. Despite notes 4f., the statement does not include any commitment to evaluate, and certainly no commitment to actually reduce, the carbon risk exposure of the University’s investment portfolio;

¹ Figure 20, p59 <http://www.smithschool.ox.ac.uk/research-programmes/stranded-assets/SAP-divestment-report-final.pdf>

2. University Council has not recognised the demands of students, academics and alumni who support divestment.
3. The Council statement greenwashes the University's current investment policies while making no commitment to new, substantive action.
4. As a result, the University Council has failed to take substantive action on climate change.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate SRIRC to ask University council to mandate OUem:
 - a. To explain the continued investment in fossil fuel companies in light of the inconsistencies presented (in believes 1a. and 1b.);
 - b. To use their access to the latest research on carbon exposure to evaluate their own investments with respect to carbon exposure, to include these evaluations in the yearly breakdown;
 - c. To explain whether or not (and how) these evaluations are consistent with the current investment policy;
 - d. To adjust investment practice in light of any discrepancies highlighted in the evaluation process.

Proposed: Rivka Micklethwaite (St Catherine's College)

Seconded: Emily Silcock (New College)

Motion passed without discussion.

10. Trans Full Time Officer Motion to NUS

Council Notes:

1. We passed full support for an NUS Full Time Trans Officer last trinity term (w1, TT15).
2. We (the NUS delegates) have a mandate to try and pass this through NUS National Conference.

Council Believes:

1. We should therefore submit a motion to NUS National Conference (made in consultation with other activists nationally) concerning the NUS Full Time Trans Officer motion.

Council Resolves:

1. To submit the motion "A full time paid NUS Trans Officer and an autonomous NUS Trans Liberation Campaign" as in Appendix 5.

Proposed: Vivian Holmes

Seconded: Rowan Davis

Motion passed without discussion.

h. Motions of No Confidence or censure

2. Motion to Censure Against Hayley Han (Divisional Board Rep for Postgraduate Medical Sciences)

Council Notes:

1. The Scrutiny Committee was established in Hilary 2010 to monitor the work of the OUSU team, and ensure they are held accountable to the students of the university.
2. In Michaelmas Term 2014 OUSU passed a motion, which is now policy, mandating all Executive officers to submit reports (written or verbal) to OUSU Council ordinary meetings.
3. The same OUSU policy mandates the Scrutiny Committee to bring a motion of censure against any Executive or Divisional Board Representative who fails to attend two ordinary meetings of Council.
4. That Hayley Han has failed to attend at least two ordinary Council meetings this term.
5. That a Motion of Censure is a means to formally express Council's disapproval of an individual's actions and that this censure must be declared on any future nomination forms that they submit for elected positions in OUSU.

Council Believes:

1. That a fundamental responsibility of Divisional Board Reps is to attend OUSU Council.
2. That Council should hold elected representatives of the student body who do not attend Council to account.
3. That Hayley Han has failed in her duties to attend OUSU Council ordinary meetings.

Council Resolves:

1. To remind the Executive and Divisional Board Representatives of their duties to attend ordinary OUSU Council meetings.
2. To censure Hayley Han (Divisional Board Rep for Postgraduate Medical Sciences) for failing to attend or send apologies for two or more OUSU Council ordinary meetings.

Proposed: Dan Mead (St John's)

Seconded: Brendon Casey (St Edmund Hall)

Dan Mead (St John's) – Prefaced motions by saying that the two motions of censure which he is proposing are not personal attacks, and that he takes no pleasure in bringing them, however informed council that he is mandated to bring them under policy which OUSU council has passed. Reminded officers that they should sign in when they are here, send apologies when they cannot attend, and report either verbally or written to OUSU council. Urged officers to contact Ami, Democratic Support Officer if they have any issues. Explained that the motion of censure against Hayley Han is due to her failing to attend two meetings of OUSU council without submitting apologies, therefore he is mandated to bring this motion. Asked that council pass the motion, as he has received no information why it should not be passed.

Taisie (Wadham) – Asked if we have heard any reason why Hayley was unable to attend or send apologies.

Dan – Replied that he had not heard any reason at all.

Taisie – Asked if she has been made aware of the censure.

Dan – Replied that the Democratic Support Officer emailed Hayley about the motion of censure against her.

Taisie – Asked if she replied.

Dan – Confirmed that she did not.

Motion passed with no opposition.

3. Motion to Censure Against Holly Roy (Student Parent and Carers Officer).

Council Notes:

1. The Scrutiny Committee was established in Hilary 2010 to monitor the work of the OUSU team, and ensure they are held accountable to the students of the university.
2. In Michaelmas Term 2014 OUSU passed a motion, which is now policy, mandating all Executive officers to submit reports (written or verbal) to OUSU Council ordinary meetings.
3. The same OUSU policy mandates the Scrutiny Committee to bring a motion of censure against any Executive or Divisional Board Representative who fails to attend two ordinary meetings of Council.
4. This OUSU policy also specified that the Chair of Scrutiny Committee must bring a motion of censure against any member of the Executive who fails to attend at least two meetings of the Executive.
5. That Holly Roy has failed to attend at least two ordinary Council meetings this term.
6. That Holly Roy has failed to attend at least two meetings of the Executive this term.
7. That a Motion of Censure is a means to formally express Council's disapproval of an individual's actions and that this censure must be declared on any future nomination forms that they submit for elected positions in OUSU.

Council Believes:

1. That a fundamental responsibility of members of the Executive Committee is to attend OUSU Council and meetings of the Executive Committee
2. That Council should hold officers who do not attend Council and meetings of the Executive Committee to account.
3. That Holly Roy has both failed in her duties to attend OUSU Council ordinary meetings and Executive Committee meetings.

Council Resolves:

1. To remind the Executive and Divisional Board Representatives of their duties to attend ordinary OUSU Council meetings.
2. To censure Holly Roy (Student Parents and Carers Officer) for failing to attend or send apologies for two or more OUSU Council and Executive meetings.

Proposed: Dan Mead (St John's)

Seconded: Brendon Casey (St Edmund Hall)

Dan Mead (St John's) – Noted that he feels uncomfortable bringing this motion of censure, knowing that as Student Parents and Carers Officer, Holly Roy has a young child to look after, however informed council that she has failed to submit apologies when she has had to look after the child. Explained that the issue is not that she is unable to attend council meetings, but that she has not been informing anyone that this is the case.

Taisie (Wadham) – Asked if Holly was informed that this was expected of her, and what communication had taken place.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – Asked if there was any objection to the Democratic Support Officer speaking.

No objections.

Democratic Support Officer – Informed council that Holly replied and asked how she could oppose the censure motion. Explained that she replied to Holly stating that she could attend council to oppose the motion, to which Holly sent her apologies, but without any further explanation to her previous absences.

Student - Asked if Holly had failed in any of her other duties.

Dan – Replied that she had also failed to attend Executive meetings for the same reason, but that Holly's scrutiny report is generally positive other than this.

Rowan Davis (Wadham) – Asked if anything has been done to address the reasons she cannot attend, such as childcare provision.

Dan – Replied that this is not the case in his knowledge.

Opposition received.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Stated that his opposition was not against Dan and the rest of Scrutiny Committee, who have done exactly what they are mandated to do, and that council needs to be made aware when things are not being done. Stated that both he and the Democratic Support Officer have contacted Holly to reiterate the need to send apologies etc., however requested that council uses its discretion on this occasion, firstly as Holly is a student parent, which obviously causes added complications, and is a group which OUSU very much struggle to engage with. Urged that he is very keen to not dissuade Holly and other student parents from engaging with OUSU as a result. Added that the role was switched from being supervised from VP Women to VP Graduates during this term, and that he only had the opportunity to meet Holly in 5th week.

Danny Waldman (St John's) – Agreed with Nick that we should use discretion in this case, but asked if there is anything stronger than just re-reminding but is not censure, and is rather something in the middle.

Dan – Suggested that if council choose to vote the motion down, they can vote for it next term, if the situation does not change and the same motion comes back to council.

Jess (St John's) – Asked if we could consider standing apologies for the term, if they know they will

never be able to make council.

Marina – Replied that that would be fine, however, it is up to the officer to make contact too.

Tom Wadsworth (St John's) – Highlighted that apologies are often considered to be easy, but when you are under a significant amount of stress, it may be difficult to remember to do so, or to be able to work out what to say. Suggested that we make it clear that people can apologise for numerous future meetings in one message, so they do not have the stress of remembering each time.

Dan – Added that it could also be problematic if you have an immediate emergency, however in this case, the officers in question can contact us later on to explain the situation.

Sam (Magdalen) – Suggested that the rules could be amended so that the Student Parents and Carers Officer is not mandated to attend council.

Dan – Replied that these rules are part of OUSU council policy, so this change could be proposed and passed in council if someone wanted to do so.

The majority of the room voted against this motion, with only one vote for and six abstentions.

Motion fell.

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

4. New Bye-Laws

Council Notes:

1. OUSU amended its highest governing document (the Articles of Association) at a General Meeting in December 2015, with consequential amendments required to lower documents.
2. That a new set of Bye-Laws have been proposed (Appendix 3), making these consequential changes, along with further changes outlined in Appendix 1, and changes to Exec, given in Appendix 2.
3. That Council will see proposed new Regulations and Rules in 3rd week, Trinity Term 2016, to replace current Election and General Regulations.
4. Its decision to give a First Reading in 5th week Council.
5. That the Sabbatical Officers have consulted widely on these changes, including since 5th week Council, and offered students the opportunity to discuss the changes – and to discuss potential amendments to the proposed changes. Any such amendments feature below.

Council Resolves:

1. To give a Second Reading to make new Bye-Laws (Appendix 3).

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Becky Howe (Pembroke)

Nick – Informed council that this is the return of the motion which came to the previous meeting, but with improvements. Explained that OUSU has several layers of governing documents, with the Articles at the top which define us as a charity, which were changed in December at a General Meeting in the Sheldonian. Continued that below the Articles we have the Bye-Laws, which set out

lots of details, including who the sabbatical officers are, who the Executive Committee are, what the campaigns are and what the campaigns have to do etc. Added that below these we have further documents called regulations, which we will be looking at next term. Noted that a number of these changes which we are proposing to the Bye-Laws are consequential, and need to be made due to the changes to the Articles last year. Added that we took this as an opportunity to look at the Bye-Laws more generally, to see if there are other things we wanted to change. Flagged the list of proposed changes in appendix 1, and highlighted that the biggest planned changes were to the Executive. Explained that the Executive currently comprises the six sabbatical officers and the 21 part-time officers (PTE), and stated that they do not believe that the system is working properly, a view that has also been expressed in numerous scrutiny reports before us, in consultation with previous PTE, previous sabbatical officers and campaigns, who have provided a general view that this system is not working properly. Noted that most of the PTE roles are uncontested in elections, with of number of them remaining vacant. Added that there is a lot of confusion between campaigns and PTE roles which overlap, and that sabbatical officers also have a very high workload attempting to support both. Explained that the newly proposed exec would consist of the six sabbatical officers, a representative from each campaign, and an undergraduate common room president, and a graduate common room president. Argued that this will provide a number of benefits, bringing campaigns into the centre of OUSU's work, however reported that they have been very mindful of any concerns, have had a number of meetings since the previous council, and have consequently proposed some amendments.

Amendments Received:

Bye-Laws 2016 – Second Reading Amendments

Amendment 1 (inserted into Second Reading Draft in Appendix 3)

To add Council Resolves 2:

Resolves 2. To replace Bye-Law 18.1 with the following:

18.1 The following persons are Associate Members:

- (a) each person admitted by the University to
 - (i) the *Register of Visiting Students*, or
 - (ii) the *Register of Recognised Students*, and
- (b) each person studying for a certificate or diploma of the University, who is not a Student.

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Becky Howe (Pembroke)

Nick – Explained that this makes a minor amendment following a discussion with the University on how best to word who should have associate membership from Continuing Education, clarifying that this means anyone studying for an actual certificate with Continuing Education becomes an associate member, but it excludes those who pop in for a two-hour course etc. therefore avoiding having tens of thousands of members.

Dorkina Myrick (Mansfield) – Asked if those that come here to study for approximately six weeks would be eligible.

Nick – Replied that as long as they get a certificate from the University with University branding on it, they will be captured under this definition.

Dorkina – Asked if they have to be in residence.

Nick – Answered that they can be doing distance-learning, again providing that they are studying for an official certificate.

Trinity student – Asked if this had any impact on fees which OUSU get.

Nick – Replied that this is not affected at all.

Amendment passed with no opposition.

Amendment 2

To add Council Believes 1, and Council Resolves 3, 4 and 5:

Believes 1. It is important that any changes to the Executive do not adversely affect the autonomy of liberation campaigns to choose their representatives, or the level of their representation on Council.

Resolves 3. To replace Bye-Law 13.2 (in Appendix 3) with the following:

13.2 Under Bye-Law 13.1(b), the representative must be

- (a) with Council's agreement, a Student Member elected by the OUSU Campaign or by *Raise & Give* in accordance with their constitution, or
- (b) the chair (or one of the co-chairs) of the OUSU Campaign or of *Raise & Give*.²

Resolves 4. To replace Bye-Laws 9.1 to 9.8 (in Appendix 3) with the following (together with existing footnotes):

9 Council

9.1 The members of Council are

- (a) the Chair of Council,
- (b) the Sabbatical Trustees,
- (c) representatives of Constituent Organisations,
- (d) representatives of OUSU Campaigns and of *Raise & Give*, and
- (e) Divisional Board Representatives.

9.2 The following provides for certain members of Council.

- (a) Under Bye-Law 9.1(c),
 - (i) a representative must be selected in a democratic manner in accordance with the constitution of the relevant Constituent Organisation,

² See Bye-Laws 34.6 and 35.1 for provisions covering constitutions.

- (ii) except where sub-paragraph (iii) applies, each Constituent Organisation is represented by its president (or the president's nominee) and two other members, and
- (iii) in a College with a single Constituent Organisation (representing both undergraduates and Graduates), that organisation is represented by its president (or the president's nominee) and four other members.

In this paragraph, a reference to a president includes a reference to an equivalent office.

- (b) Under Bye-Law 9.1(d), except where paragraph (c) applies, each OUSU Campaign and *Raise & Give* must appoint one representative.
- (c) The following OUSU Campaigns must appoint two representatives each:
 - (i) Campaign for Racial Awareness and Equality,
 - (ii) LGBTQ Campaign,
 - (iii) Oxford Students' Disability Community, and
 - (iv) Women's Campaign.
- (d) Under Bye-Law 9.1(e), Council must appoint as Divisional Board Representatives,
 - (i) four Student Members who are undergraduates, and
 - (ii) four Student Members who are Graduates,
 and provide each representative with a statement of their responsibilities.

9.3 The following provides for voting by members in Council.

- (a) The Chair of Council does not have a vote, other than a casting vote in the event of a tie.
- (b) All other members (whether Sabbatical Trustees or members under Bye-Law 9.2) have one vote each.

9.4 Council may establish, regulate and wind up procedural or advisory committees.

9.5 The Steering Committee has particular responsibility for compiling the agenda for Council meetings, and considering proposals relating to OUSU's governing documents. Its members are the Chair of Council, the Returning Officer, the President and two Student Members (other than a member of the Executive).

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

9.7 Council may from time to time make, repeal or amend Rules relating to Council's functions and the proceedings and procedure of Council, its meetings and its committees.

9.8 The Chair of Council's responsibilities include the proper functioning of Council, ensuring democratic debate and maintaining good order.

9.9 The quorum for meetings of Council is 35 Council members.

Resolves 5. To replace the definition of Divisional Board Representative in Schedule One (in Appendix 3) with the following:

Divisional Board Representative ... means a person appointed by Council under Bye-Law 9.2(d) to represent Students on a divisional board or other divisional committee.

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Becky Howe (Pembroke)

Nick – Explained that this amendment reflects the conversations we have been having in particular with OUSU's liberation campaigns and liberation officers, and does two separate things: firstly, it makes a slight change to who the campaign representative is on OUSU's Executive, changing it so that the campaign chooses a student member via an election that does not have to be on that campaign's own executive, and secondly it increases the number of votes on council for the liberation campaigns from one to two. Stated that there has now been an amendment submitted which proposes to amend amendment two.

Amendment received:

To amend Amendment 2, such that in the amended Bye-Law 9.2c) under Resolves 3, "two representatives" is replaced by "three representatives".

Proposed: Orla White (Brasenose)

Seconded: Farheen Ahmed (Pembroke)

Orla White (Brasenose) – Explained that this is really simple, as currently there is an LGBTQ Officer, a Graduate LGBTQ Officer and an LGBTQ Campaign, so this liberation group currently has three votes, as do others, and any diminishment of that is taking votes away from liberation.

Amendment to amendment 2 not taken as friendly.

Jacob Page (St Cross) – Stated that part of the reason that this change is going ahead is to remove some of the roles that have not been filled, which are a lot of the graduate roles, including the Graduate LGBTQ role which is never filled. Questioned how increasing the number of votes back to how it was would streamline things, and suggested that with this amendment, campaigns would set up the system that there is now where we have all these things that need doing, and we remember to add on graduates as an after thought. Expressed his frustration with this as a graduate student, and stated that he initially liked these changes to the bye-laws, as it places graduates at the centre alongside undergraduates.

Orla – Asked if one of the three votes would have to go to a graduate student.

Nick – Replied that this would be up to specific campaign constitutions.

Orla – Noted that they have taken the point on board, however believed that this would be positive for more representation.

Dan Mead (St John's) – Asked what the balance would be between common rooms and campaigns.

Nick – Replied that the common rooms would have approximately 210, and the liberation campaigns would have 12.

Rowan Davis (Wadham) – Expressed support for the proposed three votes, stating that we would have greater campaign involvement in OUSU, a greater diversity of people in attendance, and a higher probability of representing intersections.

Tom Wadsworth (St John's) - Noted that the initial proposal to have just one vote for liberation campaigns is problematic as there are more than one type of disability for example. Acknowledged that there are more than two or three as well, however this would allow for more different people to be represented.

Vote on amendment to amendment 2:

For – 45

Against – 0

Abstain – 6

Amendment to amendment 2 passed.

Vivian Holmes (Wadham) – Raised an issue with council being able to recall the executive member from a campaign, and asked if this would still be the case, or if it would be the campaign chair.

Nick – Replied that council can pass a motion of no confidence in the member of exec, and separately from that have the power to recall an election of any member of a liberation campaign executive, and can remove any member of a non-liberation campaign executive. Clarified that this is not a change, but is currently in place in the existing rules.

Vivian – Asked if the new staff member is still being employed, and if they will be accountable.

Becky Howe (Pembroke) – Answered that we having the new member of staff regardless of these changes, as we feel it is very important to have somewhere there to help both campaigns and societies. Clarified that we have a rule that you cannot discuss permanent members of OUSU staff at Council, so the sabbs will still be responsible and accountable for political decisions.

Vote on amendment:

For – 48

Against – 0

Abstain – 1

Amendment passed as amended.

Motion as amended passed with no opposition.

Lucy Delaney (Wadham) – Proposed a procedural motion to move motion 9, 'Support for #ShutDownYarlsWood and Shutting Down All Other Immigration Detention Centres' up the agenda to take place next, as the seconder has to leave in ten minutes, and the demo which we want to support is on the 12th March, and we also want to take it to NUS Conference.

Majority support received – procedural motion passed.

9. Support for #ShutDownYarlsWood and Shutting Down All Other Immigration Detention Centres

CN: detention centres, reference to sexual violence

Council Notes:

1. That Yarl's Wood is an immigration detention centre in Bedfordshire which detains refugees (of whom the majority are women) for an unlimited period without evidence of them having committed a crime.
2. That human rights abuses take place in Yarl's Wood, and there have been allegations of sexual violence, a crime which is particularly traumatic for those escaping conflict in which rape is used as a weapon.
3. That Movement for Justice,³ alongside a range of different activist groups and students, is organizing a mass demonstration outside Yarl's Wood Immigration Removal Centre on 12th March 2016.
4. That the demonstration will run under the slogan 'Shut Down Yarl's Wood', and aims to force the government to close this detention centre and ultimately the system of immigration detention entirely.
5. That the demonstration aims to bring together activists, organisers and asylum seekers from across the country to help build a network of campaigners and create links between movements.
6. That many Oxford students will be attending this demonstration.
7. That human rights abuses also take place in other immigration detention centres.
8. That OUSU has policy on the Campsfield Immigration Removal Centre which states that "OUSU believes that the law needs to be amended and government policy changed in order for the UK to be able to better carry out its obligations under international convention and the demands of natural justice. That Campsfield Immigration Removal Centre should be closed as part of a programme to drastically reduce and ultimately end immigration detention in the UK. That OUSU should seek to support and lobby for motions that are in line with the above beliefs within the NUS. That OUSU should mandate the Black & Minority Ethnic Students' & Anti- Racism Officer to support the on-going work with the Campaign to Close Campsfield."

Council Believes:

1. That the above policy (in Notes 8) means that OUSU should therefore also support the closure of Yarl's Wood and all other immigration detention centres.
2. That the need to shut down Yarl's Wood is urgent.
3. That all immigration detention centres should be shut down.

Council Resolves:

1. To support Movement for Justice's Shut Down Yarl's Wood campaign and the demonstration on 12th March.
2. To support the shutting down of all immigration detention centres.
3. To amend OUSU's policy "Campsfield Immigration Removal Centre" (passed Trinity Term 2014; see Notes 8) by:

³ Movement for Justice by Any Means Necessary is an activist group based in London, which confronts organized fascism and wider racism. Previous actions include campaigning for justice for Stephen Lawrence and shutting down demonstrations by the British National Party.

- a. changing the title of the policy to “Campsfield, Yarl’s Wood and other Immigration Removal Centres”;
 - b. adding, after “That Campsfield Immigration Removal Centre”, the words “, Yarl’s Wood Immigration Removal Centre, and all other detention centres”;
 - c. changing “the Black & Minority Ethnic Students’ & Anti Racism Officer” to “the Black & Minority Ethnic Students’ Officer, the Vice-President (Women) and the Women’s Campaign Officer”;
 - d. adding, after “the Campaign to Close Campsfield”, the words “, the Shut Down Yarl’s Wood campaign, and similar campaigns against detention centres.”
1. To mandate the OUSU President to email the student body with information about the demonstration as part of their weekly newsletter to all students, and publicise these in communications and online more generally.

Proposed: Lucy Delaney (Wadham)

Seconded: Hannah-Lily Lanyon (Wadham)

Hannah-Lily Lanyon (Wadham) – Informed council that Yarl’s Wood is an immigration detention centre in Bedfordshire with immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers and is 90% women, however with a staff made up of 50% men. Noted that OUSU already supports the closure of Campsfield detention centre. Reported that Yarl’s Wood is extremely isolated in a middle of a field, which you can only get to by car, and then a further twenty-minute walk. Informed council that it is run by Serco on behalf of the government, who have a record of human rights abuses in prisons, adding that Yarl’s Wood should not be a prison, and as a detention centre, it is worrying that it is run by Serco. Explained that Serco are inherently racist and homophobic, and often Serco go to airports and choose people who look suspicious, which is rooted in racism and Islamophobia, adding that asylum seekers who are suspected to be gay are asked to prove their sexuality. Reported that last week someone was deported back to Uganda for not being able to prove her sexuality in a specific time frame given. Added that there is indefinite detention, and that you can spend a month there with no legal representation, you are not allowed to contact the outside world, so can only speak to people if they contact you. Highlighted that this is why the demos are so important, as we hold up big signs with phone numbers on, which is the only way to give those people contact with the outside world. Reported that the system is completely arbitrary, and is about trying to control immigration statistics. Reported that there is an appalling lack of respect for human dignity, with people kept there who are suffering with PTSD, reports of sexual abuse by the male staff towards the female victims, hunger strikes and suicides. Reported that there have been numerous inquiries and inspections at Yarl’s Wood, including by the Chief Inspector of Prisons, all which have concluded there are serious concerns, with a UN Officer for human rights abuses against women being granted access, and stating that it was one of the worst things she had ever heard of.

Lucy Delaney (Wadham) – Reported that this is used as a machine by the government, in a very arbitrary manner, in order to show statistics and figures cracking down on immigration. Noted it is very common that if two people were to arrive at Yarl’s Wood with very similar circumstances, one would be deported by default, in order to be able to churn out certain statistics. Informed council that they are asking for several things from council, explaining that a demo is taking place outside Yarl’s Wood on 12th March set up by Movement for Justice, an activist organisation who are campaigning to shut down Yarl’s Wood, and we want OUSU to support this demonstration. Added

that we want to extend existing OUSU policy on Campsfield so it covers all detention centres, and we are expecting an amendment to send this motion to NUS National Conference.

Amendment received:

To add resolves 5:

‘To mandate the NUS delegates to submit a motion to NUS National Conference supporting the shutting down of all immigration detention centres in keeping with the spirit of Notes 1, 2, 7, 8, Believes 2, 3, and Resolves 2, 3.

Proposed: Vivian Holmes (Wadham)

Seconded: Rowan Davis (Wadham)

Amendment accepted as friendly.

Danny Waldman (St John’s) – Stated that holding up phone numbers is very clever, and asked if we know that the detainees have phones, and if these numbers have been called in the past following on from demos.

Lucy – Replied that they have phones and they have called numbers that have been held up in the past.

Motion passed with no opposition.

j. Motions authorising expenditure

5. Good Night Out (GNO) Oxford requests £250 to allow training in order to go into clubs to further efforts to raise awareness and change handling of harassment around Oxford

Council Resolves:

1. To contribute £250 to GNO Oxford which will go towards the training of more volunteers and providing training materials for future club training sessions.

Proposed: Tom Wadsworth (St John’s)

Seconded: Hwa Jong (Samuel) Kim (St John’s)

The above motion is part of a motion which came to 5th Week Council HT16. The motion was split into parts, and the above was tabled to 7th Week. For context, the original motion is included below. The remainder of the motion passed in 5th Week.

Council Notes:

1. *Harassment is a major issue around Oxford, and many instances occur in entertainment venues, particularly night clubs.*

2. *GNO Oxford is part of the national Good Night Out Campaign, which seeks to reduce harassment in licensed venues by educating staff on how to appropriately respond to instances of harassment. Whilst the national campaign focuses mainly on sexist and queerphobic harassment, GNO Oxford believes that ableist and racist harassment are also major issues in UK clubs and have resolved to combat them by producing extra training materials on these types of harassment. As part of the national GNO campaign, GNO Oxford is currently unable to affiliate officially with OUSU and become one of OUSU's campaigns.*
3. *GNO Oxford has so far made significant progress, and have contacted a number of clubs around Oxford, eliciting positive responses from many and securing training for all the staff at Plush for later this term. The committee are currently negotiating with several other clubs and expects to have training dates confirmed by the end of the month.*
4. *GNO mainly works by using trained facilitators to run training sessions in venues to educate nightclub staff on how to respond to harassment. In order to train a viable pool of volunteers, funding is needed and GNO Oxford has succeeded in fundraising through some common rooms which is covering some of the costs but not all.*
5. *It costs £250 for one facilitator training session, which includes the bringing in a member of the national team to train of up to 15 volunteers as facilitators and all materials to distribute to participant clubs.*

Council Believes:

1. *Harassment is unacceptable in all instances and can be particularly distressing when it is focussed against minority individuals. The negative effects of harassment can also be increased when met with a negative, blaming or doubting response from those in a position of authority, and as such it is extremely important to educate staff about harassment and how to respond to reports and disclosures.*
2. *The national GNO campaign has been incredibly successful in raising awareness of issues surrounding harassment on nights out in other cities, and has successfully worked with some of the biggest clubs in the country to improve the experiences of club-goers. GNO Oxford has the potential to have a major impact on improving experiences in nightclubs, supporting clubs to strive for a safer and harassment-free environment for their patrons.*

Council Resolves:

1. *To contribute £250 to GNO Oxford which will go towards the training of more volunteers and providing training materials for future club training sessions.*
2. *To mandate the VP Welfare and Equal Opportunities and other relevant OUSU officers to work with GNO Oxford.*
3. *To make 'Council Believes 1' and 'Council Resolves 2' OUSU policy.*

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – Reminded council that they are just debating/voting on resolves 1, which was left over from the motion in the previous meeting.

Tom Wadsworth (St John's) – Reported that last council he brought a motion which mandated Ali to support Good Night Out, who go into clubs to train staff and provide guidance on harassment. Explained that the motion was split into two parts, and this part is to request £250 to support Good Night Out, noting that it was deferred so that Ali would have chance to read the updated Good Night Out documents.

Motion opposed.

Ali Lennon (St John's) – Informed council that he did receive the new training materials, and has reviewed them with OUSU's Operations Manager, who is a former venue manager, bar staff trainer and is Security Industry Authority (SIA) qualified, and our joint strong recommendation at this stage is that the training material needs reviewing, as it is not value for money and it not up to scratch. Proposed postponing this motion until the next meeting of council, as he wants to help Good Night Out get there, and have time to work on the documents with them. Added that the discretionary budget is now getting quite small, but that this is something that is also important to him, and he would be happy to use some of his own officer budget on this when the training documents are up to a standard they are comfortable with.

Ali – Submitted a procedural motion to table the motion to 1st week council Trinity Term.

Hilal Yazan (St Hugh's) – Asked what the affects of this would be.

Tom – Replied that it would prevent us from doing a training session prior to next term.

Lucy Delaney (Wadham) – Noted that she hated to oppose training which is badly needed, but that she is not happy with the training as it currently is. Stated that we should not be giving lip service to something which is not sufficiently intersectional, and that she wanted it to be really good before we go ahead with supporting it and providing money. Urged for everyone to sit down and run through this together, as ultimately we all want the same thing.

Rowan Davis (Wadham) – Asked if either Lucy or Ali have a pathway set up for this to go down, or if they themselves are trained to sufficiently review the documents.

Ali – Replied that the Operations Manager, who is SIA qualified, who has won awards for safe club nights, who has been a venue manger is the best person to do this. Added that we would also use our connections with Security Services, as well as the Student Advice Service who are really good on harassment. Suggested also getting support from Thames Valley Police.

Lucy – Raised concerns with the positive outlook element of the training, which encourages everyone to be very positive, when realistically we need to ensure that staff are taking incidents very seriously.

Tom – Agreed it would be useful to look over any issues that you have. Noted that is was originally produced by someone with SIA training, and that they did not do it by themselves. Recognised that the positive outlook section has been framed oddly, and the intent is obviously not to suggest that people should be continuing on with their night in a happy way after an incident. Questioned why we cannot have the money agreed now, and only use it on the basis that the training manual if reviewed to a level that everyone deems appropriate.

Ali – Stated that agreeing to give money to something which we are not yet happy with would present a situation of representational risk.

Cat – Suggested we could have an amendment which stated that the money would be released when the documents had been signed off.

Tom – Argued against the idea of reputational risk, as OUSU would be supporting a group which fights against harassment.

Jacob Page (St Cross) – Asked if there are currently plans to involve Oxford Brookes, as he would be reluctant to support something which affects all the students in Oxford, if the project was only aimed at a proportion of Oxford students.

Tom – Answered that Brookes have been asked to work with us, and one of the main reasons which Ali was mandated was because he has links with Brookes, and other useful resources.

Lucy – Agreed the suggestion to release money when approved by all.

Ali – Withdrew his procedural motion, due to the suggested amendment to make clear when the money will be released.

The Chair called for a short break while the amendment to the motion was being written.

Request received for a quorum count.

The Chair suspended the meeting following the loss of quorum.

The Chair closed the meeting after 15 minutes as the meeting was inquorate.