

Council Minutes

7th Week Trinity Term 2013

7th Week Council held on Wednesday 5th June 2013 at 5.30pm in the Moser Lecture Theatre, Wadham College.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, please contact David Railton, the Chair, at motions@ousu.org

- a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
- b. Matters Arising from the Minutes
- c. Ratifications in Council
- d. Elections in Council
 - 3 positions for Complaints Committee
 - 3 positions for Internal Affairs
 - 2 positions on Steering Committee
- e. Motions Authorising Capital Expenditure
 1. Oxstu Funding
 2. Affiliation to the National Union of Students for the Academic Year 2013-14, and a Referendum on Continued Affiliation Thereafter.
 3. Abortion Rights
- f. Other Motions
 4. Bringing Already Approved Bye-Laws into Effect
 5. Complaints Procedure
 6. International Students' Campaign Constitution
 7. Clustering of Small Subjects
 8. OUSU Council Divestment Campaign
 9. Castle Mill Accommodation
- g. Any Other Business

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Minutes passed.

d. Matters Arising from the Minutes

David Bagg (Balliol)

Reminded Council had asked a question in 5th Week Council relating to the reduction of funding for the SAS and that he had not received an answer.

Katie Colliver (University)

Explained that OUSU's CEO had not been present and so a response was not possible at the present. Assured question would be answered as soon as it was possible.

It was suggested to note in Minutes that answer is needed, between now and MT13.

David J. Townsend (St John's)

Emphasised answer should be issued before MT13 if possible, such as by direct correspondence with the questioner.

David Bagg (Balliol)

Reaffirmed concern due to the fact a Motion had been passed (Student Advice Service Policy and Procedure Motion - 5th Week Council TT13) without proper explanation.

c. Ratifications in Council

None.

d. Elections in Council

The following positions were elected in Council of 7th Week:

No hust required.

1 position for Complaints Committee - Complaints board deals with any complaints raised through OUSU's statutory complaints procedure. Successful candidates will serve for one year, and further information can be obtained from motions@ousu.org

Election Results:

Andrew Rogers (Jesus) elected to Complaints Committee for one year.

e. Motions Authorising Capital Expenditure

1. OXSTU FUNDING

Council Notes:

1. OUSU owns and publishes the Oxford Student (Oxstu), one of Oxford's student-run newspapers.
2. That Oxstu is predominantly funded by advertising sales.
3. That print journalism is increasingly being superseded by online media and video journalism and that this has an impact on the Oxstu's future.
4. That the Oxstu does not have the ability to build up its own reserves or savings to spend on development.

Council Believes:

5. That it is important to support Oxford's active student media scene.
6. That the Oxstu should be supported in the development of the skill base and equipment it needs to continue provide a good service to students, and to remain financially sustainable.

Council Resolves:

7. To release £500 of the discretionary campaigns budget to be spent on improving the Oxstu's online presence and video output. This could include spending on new equipment or on web development.
8. To give the Chief Executive Officer discretion over these funds.

Proposed by: Christopher Gray (Merton College)
Seconded by: Sarah Santhosham (Corpus Christi College)

Chris Gray (Merton)

Presented motion explaining Oxstu does not have ability to raise own funds. Explained Oxstu is fully integrated with OSSL (commercial arm of OUSU). Communicated that Oxstu currently breaks even and needs funds to purchase equipment to develop online and video content. Explained that it currently loses funds due to not being able to offer online advertising, investment should return more profit.

Harry Burt (Trinity)

Questioned if Oxstu is integrated with OSSL it should be able to draw money directly.

Chris Gray (Merton)

Emphasised that Oxstu breaks even and therefore it's important it receives support.

Nathan Akehurst (Lincoln)

Questioned where funds would be spent.

Chris Gray (Merton)

Repeated intention was to use funds for equipment for online and video content improvements. Explained OSSL Board would have sign-off on expenditures, with some input from Sabbatical Officers.

David Bagg (Balliol)

Questioned the possibility of Oxstu paying funds back if revenue streams were opened.

Chris Gray (Merton)

Emphasised that Motion cannot be changed to detail a loan and that a vote was preferable.

Harry Burt (Trinity)

Queried funds would be paid back in any case due to integration with OSSL.

Chris Gray (Merton)

Confirmed query.

Jack Matthews (University)

Questioned why funds were not coming out of OSSL budget. Stated that at present relation between OUSU and Oxstu is good, emphasising editorial independence, and that there would be cause for concern if funding proposal changed the relationship. Communicated funds can and should be requested from OSSL. Stated cannot support Motion.

Anya Metzger (Worcester)

Queried that Oxstu Board includes an OUSU Executive Officer in any case.

Jack Matthews (University)

Repeated previous points and emphasised need for editorial independence.

Nathan Akehurst (Lincoln)

Raised query over the giving of funds in past.

Chair

Responded query was a point of debate and not a question.

Anya Metzger (Worcester)
Question not recorded.

Jack Matthews (University)
Responded that there is a perception within student body that sees Oxstu being controlled by OUSU, although this detail is not related to Motion.

David J. Townsend (St John's)
Proposed amendment.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT:
Change Council Resolves 2: replace 'Chief Executive Officer' with 'Directors of OSSL Ltd'

Chris Gray (Merton)
Accepted amendment as friendly.

David Messling (St John's)
Communicated that Board Directors include Sabbatical Officers.

David J. Townsend (St John's)
Explained that Chief Executive Officer also sits on Board, and that Sabbatical Officers sit on Board as publishers, not editors: Board's job is not to decide content, but to protect OSSL from legal liability for defamation and to consider long-term future of the newspaper.

Chris Gray (Merton)
Emphasised that Motion and funds do not threaten editorial independence.

Jack Matthews (University)
Repeated concerns raised.

Motion Passed. 46 For. 3 Against. 3 Abstentions.

2. AFFILIATION TO THE NATIONAL UNION OF STUDENTS FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2013-14, AND A REFERENDUM ON CONTINUED AFFILIATION THEREAFTER

Council Notes:

1. That OUSU is presently affiliated to the National Union of Students (NUS).
2. That s 22 (2) (l) (i) of the *Education Act 1994* (UK) requires a members of a student union to decide annually on affiliation to external organisations (such as the NUS), which means that affiliation is a year-to-year question for OUSU.
3. That up to the present year, the University block grant to OUSU has included certain earmarked funding which could only be spent on the specified purpose.
4. That up to the present year, the NUS affiliation fee has been the subject of such earmarked funding, the amount of which increased as the NUS affiliation fee increased.
5. That as a result of this system of earmarked funding for NUS affiliation which increased as the affiliation fee increased, NUS affiliation was effectively free for OUSU up to the present year, as it was entirely covered by the University.
6. That from the academic year 2013-2014, the University block grant to OUSU will be increased to approximately £500 000 per year, and will no longer include earmarking.

7. That as a result of the increase in the block grant, the NUS affiliation fee for 2013-2014 would be £27 987.90, as against a 2012-2013 affiliation fee of £25 308.
8. That the budgeted revenue for 2013-2014 deriving from NUS affiliation (from the sale of NUS Extra cards and the similar products) is £7 500, leaving a net NUS affiliation cost to OUSU of £20 487.90.
9. That as a result of the removal of earmarking, were the £27 987.90 not spent on NUS affiliation, it could be spent on any other project or strategic interest of OUSU.

Council Believes:

1. That there is need for a national-level organisation to represent students on national-level issues, such as fee levels, loan schemes, visa regulations and fair access agreements.
2. That the specific services provided by the NUS to OUSU have been of variable quality and relevance in previous years, as expressed in previous affiliation debates.
3. That concerns about the value-for-money of NUS affiliation to Oxford students have been raised in previous affiliation debates, but have been answered by the argument that such a calculation was impossible to perform as there was effectively no OUSU money being spent.
4. That, putting aside specific benefits to Oxford students themselves, the principle of student solidarity across the UK is important to Oxford students.
5. That NUS affiliation is a significant political question, and with the change from effectively free affiliation to affiliation at a net cost of over £20 000 per year, the membership at large must be consulted by referendum on continued affiliation.
6. That the successful outcome of the funding negotiations this year, including the removal of the earmarking, was not known in time to organise a referendum on affiliation for 2013-2014.
7. That in advance of a referendum on continued affiliation, OUSU's Full-Time and Part-Time Executive Officers, and its permanent employees, should work with relevant officers and employees of the NUS to establish how continued affiliation could provide maximum value to Oxford students.

Council Resolves:

1. To renew OUSU's affiliation to the National Union of Students for the academic year 2013-2014.
2. To hold a referendum in or before Trinity Term 2014 to determine whether OUSU should renew its affiliation to the National Union of Students for the academic year 2014-2015.

Proposed by: *David J. Townsend (St John's College)*
Seconded by: *Thomas Rutland (Jesus College)*

David J. Townsend (St John's)

Explained University is affiliated with NUS and that affiliation is done on yearly basis, as the law requires. Up until now, the University has paid the cost of affiliating, so that it is effectively free for OUSU. In the future, cost of affiliating will come out of OUSU's un-earmarked budget and so a referendum will be necessary, for reasons of democracy, to decide affiliation for academic year 2014-15. This will enable students to consider the whole balance of costs and benefits which affiliation incurs. Communicated that after this referendum, NUS affiliation may be something decided by a vote in Council - need not be referenda every year after the first one. Highlighted Motion has been seconded by President-Elect who is aware of future issues such as the referendum.

Marion Wyllie (Queen's)

Questioned if students would lose NUS cards if University disaffiliated.

David J. Townsend (St John's)

Responded that this would be the case and that OUSU currently receives a small amount of money from each student sign-up.

James Newton (Keble)

Queried if affiliation cost would come in next year.

David J. Townsend (St John's)

Confirmed this would be the case and that cost was included in current budget forecast but that it would be an important question and choice in the future. There was not time this year to have a referendum after the new financial arrangements were reached during the Easter Vacation. Emphasised that in past NUS affiliation was effectively free due to University funding it.

William Neaverson (Christ Church)

Questioned differences between funding arrangements.

David J. Townsend (St John's)

Communicated that it is a technical issue to do with funding mechanism. Presently, the University pays a block grant to OUSU. Up until present year, this included a specific line item for NUS affiliation which the University would cover (however large or small it was) and which could never be spent on anything but NUS affiliation (would just be removed from grant if OUSU disaffiliated). From next year, grant is unearmarked and so NUS affiliation represents a real cost and a real choice between spending around £20 000 net on affiliation rather than spending that money on other priorities identified by Council.

James Blythe (Brasenose)

Queried and asked for further clarification on Council Believes 7.

David J. Townsend (St John's)

Responded that point focuses on getting the best out of affiliation reflecting Oxford and its particularities. Communicated that development of NUS financial support, such as grants for specific projects done by OUSU, is desirable.

William Neaverson (Christ Church)

Opposed Motion. Emphasised that students do not have a say on the matter. Highlighted the present underfunding of OUSU and that its project budgets are small. Stated funds are needed and would be better spent internally.

Katie Colliver (University)

Agreed with concerns raised. Reminded Council Motion is a vote on a referendum and that it is fairer to pass Motion so that University-wide referendum is held.

Jack Matthews (University)

Stated in favour of referendum. Emphasised especially important to question and scrutinise benefit Oxford receives from NUS, provision of training, etc. Highlighted that referendum and debate will provide the opportunity to ask most important questions.

Sarah Bine (Wadham)

Reminded Council that WomCam benefits from NUS affiliation.

Arianna Tassinari (St Antony's)

Agreed support is also there for other campaigns and that international students benefit from

affiliation and the work that NUS does.

Chris gray (Merton)

Agreed with point and confirmed that there are many Oxford issues/campaigns NUS has supported.

David J. Townsend (St John's)

Rounded-up by emphasising that on present evidence of NUS campaigns, and at this point in OUSU's budgetary year, it was worth re-affiliating to the NUS for the coming year, but to do so on condition that there be a referendum regarding affiliation for the following year so that all students could have their say.

William Neaverson (Christ Church)

Rounded-up by emphasising funds were needed and that the 2008 reforms had not been satisfactory. Agreed that points raised about the benefit to campaigns were important, but that overall it was not worth £30,000.

Motion passed. 49 For. 1 Against. 1 Abstention.

3. ABORTION RIGHTS

Council Notes:

1. That OUSU has a pro-choice policy, which resolves "to support a woman's right to choose," and "to campaign to extend students' right of practical access to an abortion, and to extend their rights of choice over their own pregnancies."
2. That this policy further resolves "to work with other groups campaigning for the above objects."
3. That Abortion Rights is the only abortion-focused campaigning and advocacy organisation in the UK, providing up to date information to campaigners and campaigning materials.

Council Believes:

1. That OUSU's pro-choice policy should be acted upon.
2. That Abortion Rights offers helpful resources and support to assist OUSU in its work.

Council Resolves:

1. To affiliate to Abortion Rights at a cost of £75 per annum.

Proposed by: *Rebekka Hammelsbeck (University College)*

Seconded by: *Suzanne Holsomback (Green Templeton College)*

Rebekka Hammelsbeck (University)

Presented Motion and outlined key points. Emphasised that it was a small amount and that organisation is in-line with OUSU's own campaigns and supportive of students' rights more generally. Explained that affiliating with something on a national level is beneficial. Highlighted Abortion Rights is only organisation campaigning for Pro-choice. Communicated that subscriptions are only revenue stream for organisation.

Jack Matthews (University)

Questioned the effect of not being affiliated.

Rebekka Hammelsbeck (University)

Confirmed OUSU not affiliated for past two years. Emphasised that OUSU much closer to

information and advice if affiliated.

Motion passed.

f. Other Motions

4. BRINGING IN ALREADY APPROVED BYE-LAWS INTO EFFECT

Council Notes:

1. That the hierarchy of OUSU's governing documents runs down from Memorandum & Articles of Association to Bye-Laws to Regulations.
2. That the current Bye-Laws were approved by OUSU Council in Trinity Term 2012.
3. That some of the Bye-Laws came into effect immediately on approval, whereas others were to come into effect according to a schedule drawn up by OUSU Council's Internal Affairs Committee.
4. That the delay in bringing some Bye-Laws into effect was intended to allow for the approval of the necessary Regulations (and other documents) to underpin those Bye-Laws.
5. That OUSU Council has approved the General Regulations and Complaints Procedure.
6. That Internal Affairs Committee recommends that Bye-Laws 5.4, 10.1, 11, 14.2, 16.1, 27 and 32 (see Appendix 1A) be brought into effect immediately.
7. That Internal Affairs Committee shall in course of time recommend to OUSU Council that other Bye-Laws be brought into effect when the necessary underpinning Regulations (and other documents) are in place.

Council Resolves:

1. To bring Bye-Laws 5.4, 10.1, 11, 14.2, 16.1, 27 and 32 (Appendix A) into effect immediately.

Proposed by: *David J. Townsend (St John's College)*

Seconded by: *Jack Matthews (University College)*

Passed Nem Con.

5. COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

Council Notes:

1. As part of OUSU's constitutional overhaul, existing Standing Orders are being replaced by new governance documents, including Bye-Laws.
2. OUSU Bye-Laws Section 27 requires that OUSU have a Complaints Committee.
3. OUSU Bye-Laws Section 32 lays out the requirements of the OUSU Complaints Procedure, and terms under which Complaints Committee operates.
4. After considerable consultation with OUSU's Trustee Board, the attached Complaints Procedure (Appendix B) has been produced to the above requirements.

Council Resolves:

1. To approve the OUSU Complaints Procedure.

Proposed by: *Katie Colliver (University College)*

Seconded by: *David J Townsend (St. John's College)*

Passed Nem Con.

6. INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' CAMPAIGN CONSTITUTION

Council Notes:

- That the International Students' Campaign is an autonomous campaign of OUSU.
- That the Campaign's constitution has not been updated for a number of years and is now out of date in regards to committee positions and the operations of the Campaign.
- That changes to a autonomous Campaign's constitution must be ratified by Council.
- That the attached revised Constitution (Appendix A) has had only technical details amended (highlighted) and that the activities and mission of the Campaign remain unchanged.

Council Resolves:

- To ratify the new constitution (Appendix C).

Proposed by: *Christopher Gray (Merton College)*

Seconded by: *Pakavarin Louphrasitthiphol (Pembroke College)*

Passed Nem Con.

8. OUSU COUNCIL DIVESTMENT CAMPAIGN

Council Notes:

1. The University of Oxford recently entered a partnership with Shell, a big oil company. This resulted in a student-organised protest that garnered a great deal of support throughout the student body.
2. The University's earth sciences department has many links to fossil fuel companies, and has accepted funding from them in the past.
3. The University of Oxford has a history of accepting donations from foreign regimes that have committed large-scale environmental destruction. For example, in 2005 the university received £1.5m from the United Arab Emirates' Zayed Bin Sultan al-Nahayan Charitable and Humanitarian Foundation. Previous donations have also come from the Government of Saudi Arabia.
4. The University's financial structure, as well as the collegiate system, makes it very difficult to ascertain which organisations the University has invested in or accepted money from.

Council Believes:

1. The University of Oxford should not invest in or accept money from sources of which its student body has repeatedly expressed its disapproval.
2. The University should not, on a matter of principle, accept money from sources which may have a significant financial interest in the way a course is taught or how a controversial topic (such as climate change) is presented to students.
3. The financial affairs of the University, in particular its record of investment and accepting donations, should be as transparent as possible, so that the student body can be sure that it abides by points 1.) and 2.)

Council Resolves:

1. Make known to the University its support for greater transparency with respect to financial transactions involving organisations in the fossil fuel industry, and for the University to cooperate with divulging, on request, information relating to previous transactions.
2. Mandate the Vice President (Charities and Community) to raise this at Socially Responsible Investment Review Committee and other appropriate fora.
3. Make all the points in the 'Council Believes' section, and point 1.) in the 'Council Resolves' section policy guidelines of OUSU.

Proposed by: Ben Jarvis (Keble College)
Seconded by: James Fisher (Mansfield College)

Passed Nem Con.

7. CLUSTERING OF SMALL SUBJECTS

Council Notes:

1. Many Oxford courses are small in number, with several having students numbers in the region of under 10 students per year.
2. Joint Schools coordination is an issue frequently raised by students through JCR Academic Feedback sessions, as well as by the OUSU Undergraduate Teaching Report and in lower scores on course organisation in the NSS and Student Barometer.
3. Students on small courses with only one tutor in their college for their subject are at risk of having no academic point of contact in their college should their tutor leave.

Council Believes:

1. Concentrating small subjects into a smaller number of colleges would be beneficial for student welfare.
2. The clustering of small Joint School subjects in certain colleges would be helpful for the organisational problems associated with Joint Schools.
3. It is beneficial for a student's academic development and welfare to have more than one tutor overseeing their course.

Council Resolves:

1. That it shall be OUSU policy to support clustering of small subjects, including small Joint Schools, around certain colleges, with the aim of
 - a) ensuring that for every course offered by a college there are normally at least two students in each year group.
 - b) ensuring that for every course offered by a college there is normally more than one tutor in a students subject area who can provide academic oversight for their degree.
2. To make 'Council resolves' 1 Policy Guidelines.

Proposed by: David Messling (St John's College)
Seconded by: Katie Colliver (University College)

David Messling (St John's)

Presented Motion communicating that University increasingly thinking and moving to organise small subjects across Colleges. Confirmed Motion supports concentration of small subjects and that a concentration of students is good for both welfare and academic reasons. Assured Council that Motion was not supporting certain Colleges having a monopoly on certain subjects. Emphasised that policy protects on-course students if sole College academic leaves.

David Bagg (Balliol)

Questioned parameters of classification. Mentioned that with some 'small' subjects, e.g those studying both Classics and English, students benefit from presence of associated larger subjects in the College.

David Messling (St John's)

Confirmed that these subjects should be considered 'small'. Communicated that feedback shows that still these students have difficulty finding a community, as well as other issues.

Nathan Akehurst (Lincoln)

Queried and brought up the case of Joint Schools at Lincoln.

David Messling (St John's)

Confirmed that case of Admissions and Joint Schools is not transparent and that concentration proposal should help. Proposal will enable better forecasting and also make transparent those Colleges with an embedded student community in a small subject.

Rosie Carpenter (Somerville)

Questioned how proposal would ensure there is a College tutor for Joint Schools.

David Messling (St John's)

Responded that proposal affects less Joint School students and more so students in areas like Earth Sciences.

Angus Hawkins (Balliol)

Queried Believes 2 and how true it was.

David Messling (St John's)

Responded that it was correct to emphasise issue at Department/Faculty level, but that re-organising at College level was a good and appropriate place to start.

James Blythe (Brasenose)

Questioned the implications for Graduate students.

David Messling (St John's)

Confirmed that proposal was focused on undergraduate students, but that clustering at graduate level was a possibility.

Nathan Akehurst (Lincoln)

Highlighted that similarities between college policies should be considered. Warned against students' choice being limited.

David Messling (St John's)

Agreed that it was important not to create College monopolies.

David Bagg (Balliol)

Questioned if colleges had been consulted.

David Messling (St John's)

Confirmed that Colleges, Departments/Faculties, as well as Divisions, on various committees, had been consulted and there was a general consensus in favour of clustering proposal, but recognition that there were practicality issues.

Richard Mathers (Merton)

Agreed with principle but felt limiting students to certain Colleges is not good and proposal would dissuade certain students from certain Colleges.

Chris Gray (Merton)

Highlighted that this is already the case with Colleges not offering certain subjects.

Motion passed. 34 For. 6 Against. 4 Abstentions

9. CASTLE MILL ACCOMMODATION

Council Notes:

1. The University's construction of student residential blocks on Roger Dudman Way ("Castle Mill"), on the southern edge of Port Meadow, has been heavily criticised.
2. Several accusations have been made against the University's handling of the development, including the following (please also see Appendix D):
 - a) That there was inadequate advertising and consultation prior to the development.
 - b) That no Environmental Impact Assessment was carried out (as expected for developments of this kind).
 - c) That a strongly critical report on the development by the City Council Heritage Officer was suppressed before the West Area Planning Committee meeting which awarded planning permission.
 - d) That the plans which were submitted to the Committee featured misleading blueprints and incorrectly stated that the buildings would not be visible from the majority of Port Meadow.
 - e) That the site is contaminated and concerns about its safety have not yet been fully put to rest.

Council Believes:

1. That the University's handling of the Roger Dudman Way development has damaged its reputation and its relationship with the people of Oxford.
2. That the University has not, to date, issued an adequate response to the accusations it has faced.
3. That the University should answer accusations made against it quickly, in detail, and with full transparency.

Council Resolves:

1. To issue a formal statement expressing its disapproval of the University's management of the Roger Dudman Way development.
2. To mandate the President to lobby the relevant University office for detailed answers to the accusations made against it.
3. To request the University, if the accusations made against it are true, to lower the height of the buildings so as to mitigate their impact on Port Meadow.

Proposed by: *Gabriel Roberts (Worcester College)*

Seconded by: *Stephen Ross (St John's College)*

Gabriel Roberts (Worcester)

Presented Motion and the issues at stake with reference to submitted appendix, Appendix D. Communicated compromise may be considered with reference to Council Resolves 3. Emphasised importance of Motion sending clear message to University regarding future planning applications and subsequent development.

David J. Townsend (St John's)

Questioned what objections proposer had made to original planning application.

Gabriel Roberts (Worcester)

Explained was not aware of planned development, despite walking past site daily. Explained that as soon as aware wrote to MP.

Henry Chong (Harris Manchester)

Questioned what lowering building would achieve.

Gabriel Roberts (Worcester)
Communicated would put building below tree line, at substantial expense.

David Bagg (Balliol)
Questioned how University suppressed City Council report.

Gabriel Roberts (Worcester)
Apologised that this aspect may have been unclear and that issue related to University not properly recognising or including City Council report, rather than suppressing it.

William Brown (New)
Questioned the effect of lowering building.

Gabriel Roberts (Worcester)
Confirmed it would decrease size and capacity.

Anya Metzger (Worcester)
Queried where would be a suitable graduate accommodation site.

Gabriel Roberts (Worcester)
Questioned relevance and place of question and confirmed that in theory current site, as brown field site, is not necessarily bad.

Harry Burt (Trinity)
Queried Council Resolves 3 as most controversial and that if true legal action possible.

Gabriel Roberts (Worcester)
Agreed that outcome of judicial review may shed further light on application and subsequent development.

David J. Townsend (St John's)
Referred to potential decrease in postgraduate housing capacity for the coming September and questioned where incoming students would be accommodated if building was lowered.

Gabriel Roberts (Worcester)
Accepted that there would be a problem for these incoming students.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT:
Remove Council Resolves 3

Gabriel Roberts (Worcester)
Accepted amendment as friendly.

Chris Gray (Merton)
Agreed accusations and issues should be investigated. Highlighted University was given planning permission and that it is going to judicial review which seems most appropriate place for a debate and review. Confirmed had received communication on environmental impact from University and said that going ahead with Motion could damage OUSU's relationship with University.

Jack Matthews (University)
Highlighted building had already been built and therefore impractical to act. Agreed judicial review was best place for debate and review. Emphasised City Council should have put planning

signs up as this is their job, not the University's, and that it is very difficult for graduate students to find accommodation.

Francesca Whalen (Balliol)

Emphasised odd to issue statement when judicial review has not taken place.

Brown (Pembroke)

Echoed previous comments by VP Graduates and emphasised the need for housing.

Chair

Initiated move to vote. 28 For. 4 Against.

Gabriel Roberts (Worcester)

Emphasised that judicial review wasn't assured. Highlighted it was right to act now and send a message to University regarding future developments.

Chris Gray (Merton)

Reemphasised points raised.

Chair

Reminded Council that vote was on amended version.

Motion fell. 4 For. 28 Against.

g. Any Other Business

David Bagg (Balliol)

Questioned where full election results of Divisional Board Representatives could be found.

Council

Communicated results could be found on Facebook.

Chair

Closed meeting and thanked Council for an enjoyable two terms as Chair. Chris Gray (Merton) presented Chair with a small gift, the contents of which appeared to be spiritous.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - Brining Already-Approved Bye-Laws into Effect

Elections, Referenda and Indicative Polls

5 Elections

...

5.4 General Regulations must provide for the responsibilities of delegates to any External Organisation to which OUSU is affiliated.

...

Council and Policy Guidelines

10 Council (Article 13)

10.1 The members of Council are

- (a) the Chair of Council,
- (b) members of the Executive Committee,
- (c) the representatives of Constituent Organisations,
- (d) a representative of each Campaign, and
- (e) the Divisional Board Representatives.

General Regulations must provide for the identification of the organisations and their representatives under (c) of this Bye-Law. Each Campaign must appoint its representative under (d).

...

11 Policy Guidelines

11.1 General Regulations must provide for the setting of Policy Guidelines by Members in general meeting and, subject to Article 14.4, by

- (a) Student Members by Referendum,
- (b) Council, and
- (c) the Postgraduate Strategy Summit.

Any Policy Guidelines set by the Postgraduate Strategy Summit may cover only matters relating to Graduates, and must be ratified by Council to have effect.

11.2 General Regulations must also provide for the

- (a) period of validity,
 - (b) overturning,
 - (c) lapsing, and
 - (d) continuing
- of Policy Guidelines.

11.3 Policy Guidelines may not be set other than as provided in Bye-Law 11.1, save that the Executive Committee may set one or more Policy Guidelines when at least two-thirds of its total membership decides that the need for prompt action so requires. Any Policy Guidelines set by the Executive Committee under this Bye-Law lapse unless ratified at the next meeting of Council.

11.4 The Full Time Officers

- (a) must inform the Trustees of any change to Policy Guidelines as soon as it takes effect; and,
- (b) when the Trustees' obligations under Article 13.2 are engaged, must advise the Trustees on the applicability to such obligations of one or more Policy Guidelines, and on their purpose.

...

14 Postgraduate Strategy Summit

14.2 General Regulations must provide for the constitution and terms of reference of the Postgraduate Strategy Summit, including

- (a) the calling, holding, proceedings and procedure of each meeting,

- (b) subject to Bye-Law 11.1, the setting of Policy Guidelines,
- (c) who may attend meetings,
- (d) who may vote at meetings,
- (e) the opportunity for any Graduate to attend meetings as observer and raise issues, and
- (f) the management of the Postgraduate Strategy Summit between meetings.

...

16 Executive Officers

16.1 The Executive Officers are the Part Time Officers of OUSU. General Regulations must provide for the number and titles of the Part Time Officers. All Part Time Officers are of equal status.

...

27 Complaints Committee

27.1 The Complaints Committee is an executive Board Committee and its members are

- (a) five Student Members, and
- (b) the four External Trustees.

The members of the Complaints Committee under (a) of this Bye-Law must be appointed by Council. The Complaints Committee must choose its chair each time it meets.

27.2 The Complaints Committee considers complaints under Bye-Laws 32.2 and 32.3 in accordance with the Complaints Procedure.

...

Complaints

32 Complaints Procedure (Article 39)

32.1 The following provisions apply to the Complaints Procedure.

- (a) Subject to paragraph (b), the Complaints Committee must establish, administer and publish the Complaints Procedure.
- (b) The Complaints Committee must consult the Board and the University on the provisions of, and any amendments to, the Complaints Procedure before publication.
- (c) The Complaints Procedure, and any amendments, take effect on publication.
- (d) The Board must review the Complaints Procedure at least once in each Academic Year.

32.2 A Student may make a complaint under the Complaints Procedure in respect of any matter set out in Article 39.3.12.

32.3 Except where Bye-Law 32.2 applies, and subject to Bye-Law 32.4, a Student Member may make a complaint under the Complaints Procedure in respect of

- (a) the Student Member's membership of OUSU;
- (b) the conduct of
 - (i) a Full Time Officer (or Full Time Officer-elect),
 - (ii) a Part Time Officer,
 - (iii) the Chair of Council,
 - (iv) the Returning Officer or Deputy Returning Officers,
 - (v) any other elected officer of Council, or
 - (vi) any person appointed by Council to serve on any committee (or sub-committee) referred to in these Bye-Laws; and
- (c) the lawfulness of any Bye-Law, General Regulation or Election Regulation.

32.4 The Complaints Procedure does not apply to any complaint

- (a) against any OUSU employee (other than a Full Time Officer), or
- (b) under Bye-Laws 9.1, 25.5, 28.1, 29.1 or 30.2.

32.5 The Complaints Procedure must provide for such procedural and other matters as are necessary to allow a complaint to which either Bye-Law 32.2 or 32.3 applies to be dealt with promptly and fairly. Such provision must include

- (a) the procedural matters set out in Article 39.3.12;
- (b) the conditions and procedure for making such a complaint;
- (c) the internal procedure for the consideration and resolution of such a complaint, including
 - (i) the jurisdiction of the Complaints Committee and its Chair,
 - (ii) handling conflicts of interest on the Complaints Committee or otherwise,
 - (iii) the use of mediation, and
 - (iv) provision for Council to be involved before any appeal;
- (d) provision for an appeal (which in the case of a complaint under Bye-Law 32.2 is by way of a reference to the independent person referred to in Article 39.3.12);
- (e) provision of an effective remedy where such a complaint is upheld; and
- (f) arrangements for the redaction and publication of rulings and reports.

32.6 The Complaints Procedure must provide for the terms of reference and procedure of the Complaints Committee.

APPENDIX B - OUSU Complaints Procedure

Oxford University Student Union
company no. 07314850
charity no. 1140687

COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE
established and published by the
Complaints Committee of the Board of Trustees

This is the **Complaints Procedure** which Bye-Law 32 requires the Complaints Committee of the Board to establish, publish and administer. It does not cover complaints in respect of elections, the Student Advice Service, media services, other financially supported student services, or OUSU employees.

How to complain ...	paragraphs A 1 to A 26
Confidentiality Policy ...	paragraphs B 1 to B 11
Complaints Committee Desk Instructions ...	paragraphs C 1 to C 28
Annex One : Bye-Laws 27 and 32	
Annex Two : University Role	

COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

How To Complain

Introduction

- A 1 At OUSU, we are committed to providing the best possible service to students. If we fail to achieve this, we want to know about it. This will enable us not only to deal with the specific problem, but also to avoid it happening again.
- A 2 You have the right to complain to us if you are dissatisfied in your dealings with OUSU and we have a duty to deal with your complaint promptly and fairly through a complaints procedure. We must also provide you with an effective remedy if your complaint is upheld.
- A 3 In particular, you have the right to complain to us if you believe you have been unfairly disadvantaged by reason of your having exercised your right not to be a member of OUSU.
- A 4 If, after we have considered your complaint, you are dissatisfied with the outcome, you have the right to refer your complaint to the University.

Confidentiality

- A 5 We respect the confidentiality of any student who wishes to complain to us. Please read our confidentiality policy for more about this.

Complaints procedure : overview

- A 6 There may be a number of stages in the handling of your complaint. The procedure may appear complex, but we hope that you will not be deterred from complaining if you feel you need to. The procedure is there to ensure that we are as fair as we can be.
- A 7 This is an overview of our procedure.
- The first stage is to see whether we can meet your concerns, quickly and informally.
 - If we cannot, in the second stage we set up a panel (usually of two fellow students and one of our external trustees). It will take a more formal approach, but still with the aim of dealing with your concerns promptly and fairly.
 - If you are dissatisfied with the panel's decision, you may appeal to a larger panel (usually of three fellow students and two external trustees): the third stage.

- And, as already noted, you may after that refer your complaint to the University, if you are still not satisfied.

A 8 As our confidentiality policy points out, normally, your complaint will only be seen by those considering your complaint at each stage.

What might you complain about?

A 9 Your dissatisfaction with OUSU may concern

- the conduct of a sabbatical or executive officer, the chair of Council, or another OUSU official,
- your membership of OUSU, or
- one of our Bye-Laws or Regulations.

A 10 We have other procedures for complaints about elections, the Student Advice Service, and the conduct of OUSU staff.

How to complain

A 11 Please put your complaint in writing and bring it by hand, or send it by post, to the OUSU office (2 Worcester Street, Oxford OX1 2BX) in a sealed envelope (marked COMPLAINT). We recommend that you do not use email.

A 12 Please

- write clearly and in English,
- include your full name and College,
- provide a full description of your concerns, including the circumstances of any dissatisfaction or alleged unfair disadvantage,
- if appropriate, include a full description of any allegation against another person, naming that person, and
- tell us what you seek as a remedy. A suitable remedy might be an apology or a recommendation for a change to OUSU working practices. We will not provide a remedy which requires OUSU, or another, to pay a sum of money.

Stage One : informal resolution

A 13 The person considering your complaint initially will get to work right away and make contact with you. The aim, at this stage, is to explore with you whether your complaint

might be resolved speedily and informally. We always hope that informal resolution will be possible, but if it is not, you have the right to take your complaint to the next stage.

Stage Two : formal resolution

- A 14 If informal resolution is not possible, a panel will need to investigate your complaint; although, once again, they will work as quickly as possible.
- A 15 During this stage, the panel will need to provide relevant information to anyone against whom you have made an allegation, and invite them make a statement. And the panel may wish to invite you or someone else to answer questions, or provide relevant information.
- A 16 When the panel has concluded its work, it will decide whether or not your complaint is wholly or partly justified. It will also need to consider what remedy might be effective.
- A 17 The panel's decision will be sent to you and anyone else who has been involved in the panel's consideration. The decision will include the text of the complaint, brief reasons for the decision, and any remedy. A summary of the panel's decision will appear on the OUSU website, using anonymised data as set out in our confidentiality policy.

Stage Three : appeal

- A 18 If you (or a person who has been involved in the panel's consideration) are dissatisfied with the outcome, you or they may appeal. The appeal will be heard by a totally new panel which will review the earlier panel's decision.
- A 19 Please put your appeal in writing and bring it by hand, or send it by post, to the OUSU office (address as above) in a sealed envelope (marked COMPLAINT APPEAL). As before, we recommend that you do not use email. Please
- include your original complaint, and the panel's decision,
 - give your reasons why your complaint has not been resolved to your satisfaction, and
 - tell us what you seek as a remedy.
- A 20 The new panel will review the earlier panel's decision. This means that the new panel will not be starting afresh, but will take careful account of what the earlier panel did and said. The new panel will need to consider the earlier panel's decision and decide for itself

whether or not it agrees with it. To assist the new panel, you will be asked to set out your grounds for appeal. The most common grounds are that the earlier panel was unaware of information of direct relevance, made a significant error of fact, or that the earlier panel's procedure was unfair.

A 21 As before, the new panel will need to provide relevant information to anyone against whom you have made an allegation, and invite them make a statement. And the panel may wish to invite you or someone else to answer questions, or provide relevant information.

A 22 When the new panel has concluded its work, it will decide whether or not your appeal is wholly or partly justified. It will also need to consider what remedy might be effective. As mentioned, a remedy will not include the payment of a sum of money by OUSU or someone else.

A 23 The panel's decision will be sent to you and anyone else who has been involved in the appeal. The decision will include the text of the appeal, brief reasons for the decision, and any remedy. As before, a summary of the panel's decision will appear on the OUSU website, using anonymised data as set out in our confidentiality policy below.

A 24 The same procedure applies to someone else who is entitled to appeal.

Reference to the University

A 25 If you have exhausted the OUSU Complaints Procedure without your complaint having been resolved to your satisfaction, you may refer the matter in writing to the University. The University Council will appoint an independent person to investigate and report. They may report that your complaint should be rejected, or decide that a full investigation should be undertaken and a report made to the University Council. If your complaint is upheld at this stage, we are required to provide you with an effective remedy.

A 26 For more information about this stage, please contact the secretary to JS-c(EC)SM (the University's Council's Joint Committee with Student Members), Dr Katy Fifield, katy.fifield@admin.ox.ac.uk.

COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

Confidentiality Policy

Introduction

- B 1 We respect the confidentiality of any student who wishes to complain under this Procedure. We will comply with our data protection, and other legal, obligations.
- B 2 Your identity as the student complaining, the fact that you have complained, and any information or documents relating to your complaint will, normally, only be seen by those considering your complaint at each stage.
- B 3 This means that, normally, your identity will not be revealed, nor the fact that you have complained. And, any information or documents relating to your complaint will, normally, be kept confidential.
- B 4 By normally, we mean that
- you may agree to information being provided to others,
 - there may be circumstances when we are legally obliged to provide information to others without your agreement, and
 - in the interests of fairness, we may need to provide information to others while considering your complaint or appeal.
- B 5 So, unless one of the three exceptions applies, those considering your complaint at each stage will not disclose any information about you or your complaint to others in OUSU, to the University, or to anyone else outside OUSU.

Dealing fairly with your complaint or appeal

- B 6 The panel considering your complaint (at Stage Two) or appeal (at Stage Three) will be expected to provide relevant information to anyone against whom you make an allegation. The information will include your name and a statement of what is alleged. The panel is likely to invite that person to make representations.
- B 7 The panel's decision will be sent to you and anyone else who has been involved in the complaint or appeal. The decision will include the text of the complaint or appeal, brief reasons for the decision, and any remedy.

Anonymised information

- B 8 Information relating to complaints may be made more widely available, but only in an anonymised form. This means that information will be presented so as to ensure that the identity of an individual cannot be determined. It will always omit a person's name and address, and any other information which - when combined with information likely to be available to the recipient - could allow the person to be identified.
- B 9 The following are the circumstances in which anonymised information will usually be made available:
- in panel decisions published on the OUSU website,
 - in reports made by the Complaints Committee to the Trustee Board, and
 - in reports to the Chair of Council.

Contacting you

- B 10 Please make sure that you have told us how to contact you. We will only use the contact information you give us.
- B 11 If our legal (including fairness) obligations mean that we will be providing confidential information to someone, we will (where we are legally free to do so) make reasonable efforts to inform you in advance.

COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

Complaints Committee Desk Instructions

Introduction

- C 1 This Complaints Procedure is established by the Complaints Committee of the Board, having consulted the Board and the University. It covers the requirements of Bye-Laws 32.1 to 32.6 (Annex One).
- C 2 The Procedure does not have retrospective effect, nor does it affect the validity of any prior decisions.

Review, amendment and publication

- C 3 At least once in each Academic Year, the Committee needs to present a report on its work to the Board.
- C 4 The Committee may propose amending the Procedure to the Board at any time.
- C 5 The Committee is expected to publish the Procedure (in its original form, and each time it is amended) on the OUSU website within five working days of its approval. The Committee is also expected to publish the names of Committee members, and information and guidance on the making of a complaint, at least once a year.

Complaints Committee Terms of Reference etc

- C 6 The Committee has the following terms of reference.
- To consider and resolve complaints (other than those resolved informally) and appeals.
 - To ensure that a complaint or appeal is dealt with promptly and fairly.
 - To offer advice and recommendations to the Board as to the handling of complaints generally.
 - To oversee the preparation and publication of information and guidance for students who may wish to complain.
- C 7 The Committee's quorum for general (non-complaint) business is three members: two Student Members and one External Trustee. Each member has one vote with the chair having a casting vote. Pending a change to the Bye-Laws (which require the chair to be

chosen each time the Committee meets), the expectation is that a Student Member will chair the Committee for a year.

Consideration of Complaints and Appeals

- C 8 The Committee is expected to deal with a complaint (Stage Two) or appeal (Stage Three) by setting up a panel. The presumption is that
- a complaint will be considered and resolved by a panel of two Student Members and one External Trustee, and
 - an appeal will be considered and resolved by a panel of three Student Members and two External Trustees, none of whom was a member of the initial panel.
- C 9 All members of a panel will participate in the resolution of a complaint or appeal, but decisions need not be unanimous. Panels will not have chairs.

Conflict of interest

- C 10 The Committee should avoid nominating one of its members to a panel where there may be a conflict of interest, including an allegation made against that member in a complaint or appeal. In an exceptional case, the Board may authorise the Committee to disregard either the conflict, or the requirement for a Student Member majority, when setting up a panel. The overriding aim is to ensure that a complaint or appeal is dealt with promptly and fairly.

Panel participation without meeting

- C 11 A panel may consider and resolve a complaint or appeal without meeting in person. Panel members need to be satisfied they are unable to meet in person within the time periods set out below, and that they have had a reasonable opportunity to communicate with each other. Any decision taken is as effective as if it had been taken in a meeting.

Setting up a panel

- C 12 The Committee chair needs to convene a panel as quickly as possible. The expectation is that this will be within two working days of a complaint or appeal being received. The panel will be on standby to consider the complaint should informal resolution fail (Stage One).

- C 13 The Committee chair needs to notify the Chair of Council each time a complaint reaches Stage Two (ie only when informal resolution has failed). The expectation is that this will happen within five working days. The chair must only use anonymised data. A similar procedure needs to be followed if a complaint reaches Stage Three (appeal).

Complaints : stage one : informal resolution

- C 14 The Committee chair will seek an informal resolution, either personally or by nominating another Committee member or trustee. The person chosen must not be a panel member and should seek support and advice from an External Trustee (also not a panel member) where necessary. A range of tools may be used, including conciliation and mediation. The expectation is that this stage will happen between two and five working days after the panel has been set up.

Complaints : stage two : formal resolution

- C 15 If the complaint cannot be resolved informally, the Complaint Panel will need to consider it formally. The expectation is that this stage will be completed within the immediately following three working days.
- C 16 The panel will be expected to provide relevant information to anyone against whom an allegation is made in the complaint. The information will include the complainant's name and a statement of what is alleged.
- C 17 The panel will be expected to invite the complainant, anyone against whom an allegation is made, and any other interested person to make representations. During its work, the panel may wish to invite a person to answer questions, or provide relevant information or documents.
- C 18 When the panel has concluded its work, it will decide whether or not the complaint is wholly or partly justified.
- C 19 If the complaint is upheld, the panel will need to consider an effective remedy. This might be an apology or a recommendation for a change to OUSU working practices, or governance. A remedy must not include the payment of a sum of money by OUSU or someone else.

Complaints : stage two : communication

- C 20 The panel's decision will be sent within one working day to the complainant and anyone else who has been involved in the panel's consideration. The decision will include the text of the complaint, brief reasons for the decision, and any remedy.
- C 21 The Committee chair will publish a summary of the panel's decision on the OUSU website. The chair must only use anonymised data.

Appeals : stage three : formal resolution

- C 22 If a complaint has not been resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant, or another person who has been involved in the panel's consideration, either or both may appeal.
- C 23 The expectation is that the new panel will complete its work within three working days.
- C 24 While the new panel may proceed as it considers appropriate, the presumption is that the appeal will be a review of the earlier panel's decision: see what is said in A 20. The most likely grounds will be that the earlier panel was unaware of information of direct relevance, made a significant error of fact, or failed to correct a significant procedural irregularity.
- C 25 The new panel will be expected to provide relevant information to anyone against whom an allegation is made in the appeal, and invite representations. During its work, the new panel may wish to invite a person to answer questions, or provide relevant information or documents.
- C 26 When the new panel has concluded its work, it will decide whether or not the appeal is wholly or partly justified.
- C 27 If the appeal is upheld, the new panel will need to consider an effective remedy. As before, a remedy must not include the payment of a sum of money by OUSU or someone else.

Appeals : communication

- C 28 The panel's decision will be sent within one working day to the person appealing and anyone else who has been involved in the appeal. The decision will include the text of the appeal, brief reasons for the decision, and any remedy .

- C 28 The Committee chair will publish a summary of the panel's decision on the OUSU website.
The chair must only use anonymised data.

Reference to the University : stage four (Annex Two)

- C 29 Where a complaint is referred to the University, Committee members must assist the 'independent person' and other University officials in their work.

Annex One : Bye-Laws 27 and 32 from OUSU Bye-Laws (Trinity Term 2012)

27 Complaints Committee

27.1 The Complaints Committee is an executive Board Committee and its members are

- (a) five Student Members, and
- (b) the four External Trustees.

The members of the Complaints Committee under (a) of this Bye-Law must be appointed by Council. The Complaints Committee must choose its chair each time it meets.

27.2 The Complaints Committee considers complaints under Bye-Laws 32.2 and 32.3 in accordance with the Complaints Procedure.

32 Complaints Procedure (Article 39)

32.1 The following provisions apply to the Complaints Procedure.

- (a) Subject to paragraph (b), the Complaints Committee must establish, administer and publish the Complaints Procedure.
- (b) The Complaints Committee must consult the Board and the University on the provisions of, and any amendments to, the Complaints Procedure before publication.
- (c) The Complaints Procedure, and any amendments, take effect on publication.
- (d) The Board must review the Complaints Procedure at least once in each Academic Year.

32.2 A Student may make a complaint under the Complaints Procedure in respect of any matter set out in Article 39.3.12.

32.3 Except where Bye-Law 32.2 applies, and subject to Bye-Law 32.4, a Student Member may make a complaint under the Complaints Procedure in respect of

- (a) the Student Member's membership of OUSU;
- (b) the conduct of
 - (i) a Full Time Officer (or Full Time Officer-elect),
 - (ii) a Part Time Officer,
 - (iii) the Chair of Council,
 - (iv) the Returning Officer or Deputy Returning Officers,
 - (v) any other elected officer of Council, or
 - (vi) any person appointed by Council to serve on any committee (or sub-committee) referred to in these Bye-Laws; and
- (c) the lawfulness of any Bye-Law, General Regulation or Election Regulation.

32.4 The Complaints Procedure does not apply to any complaint

- (a) against any OUSU employee (other than a Full Time Officer), or
- (b) under Bye-Laws 9.1, 25.5, 28.1, 29.1 or 30.2.

32.5 The Complaints Procedure must provide for such procedural and other matters as are necessary to allow a complaint to which either Bye-Law 32.2 or 32.3 applies to be dealt with promptly and fairly. Such provision must include

- (a) the procedural matters set out in Article 39.3.12;
- (b) the conditions and procedure for making such a complaint;
- (c) the internal procedure for the consideration and resolution of such a complaint, including
 - (i) the jurisdiction of the Complaints Committee and its Chair,
 - (ii) handling conflicts of interest on the Complaints Committee or otherwise,
 - (iii) the use of mediation, and
 - (iv) provision for Council to be involved before any appeal;

- (d) provision for an appeal (which in the case of a complaint under Bye-Law 32.2 is by way of a reference to the independent person referred to in Article 39.3.12);
- (e) provision of an effective remedy where such a complaint is upheld; and
- (f) arrangements for the redaction and publication of rulings and reports.

32.6 The Complaints Procedure must provide for the terms of reference and procedure of the Complaints Committee.

Annex Two : University Role

Section 22(2)(m)(n) of the Education Act 1994

" ... (m) there shall be a complaints procedure available to all students or groups of students who

- (i) are dissatisfied in their dealings with the union, or
- (ii) claim to be unfairly disadvantaged by reason of their having exercised the right [*not to be a member of the union*] ...

(n) complaints should be dealt with promptly and fairly and where a complaint is upheld there should be an effective remedy."

Article 39.3.12 of OUSU's Articles of Association

"The role of the Trustees shall be to: ...

establish, promulgate and administer a complaints procedure available to the Students in order that any complaint they may have about the Union, including for the avoidance of doubt any claim that a Student has been unfairly disadvantaged by reason of exercising his or her right not to be a Student Member, may be raised and dealt with. Such procedure shall include provision for an independent person appointed by the University to investigate and report on complaints, shall require complaints to be dealt with promptly and fairly, and shall provide for an effective remedy where a complaint is upheld; ..."

Paragraph 3(j) of the University Code of Practice under section 22(3) of the Act (extract)

" ... If [*the OUSU Complaints Procedure*] has been exhausted without the complaint having been resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant, the matter may be referred in writing to the secretary to Council's Joint Committee with Student Members.¹ Council will appoint an independent person to investigate and report on complaints. The independent person will have, after due consideration, the power to report that the complaint should be rejected summarily or to decide that a full investigation should be undertaken and a report made to Council. If a complaint is upheld at this stage, OUSU is required by the terms of its constitution and the statutes of the University to make an effective remedy."

¹ Now JS-c(EC)SM.

APPENDIX C - International Students' Campaign

An OUSU Equal Opportunities Campaign

Constitution

Contents

- A. Aim
- B. Membership
- C. Open Meetings
- D. Executive
- E. Elections
- F. Motions and Campaigns
- G. Miscellaneous

A. Aim

A.1. The principle aim of the International Students' Campaign will be to represent and act in the interests of international students at the University of Oxford.

B. Membership

B.1. Eligibility for Membership

- a. Members of the International Students' Campaign must be members of Oxford University Student Union. Members do not have to be international students, but must have an interest in issues affecting international students.
- b. A person may request to become a member of the Campaign at any time. Requests should be submitted to internationalstudent@ousu.org.
- c. The VP Graduates and the Part-Time International Students Officer shall automatically be members.

B.2. Rights of Membership

Members shall be allowed to vote in elections; participate in the making and execution of Campaign policy at open meetings; and run for Executive positions. Each member has one vote in open meetings and in elections for the Executive.

B.3. Withdrawal of Membership

Members may withdraw from membership of the Campaign and from the mailing list at any time. Requests for withdrawal of membership must be submitted to internationalstudent@ousu.org.

B.4. Revoking or Denial of Membership

The Executive may, by means of a unanimous vote, deny or revoke the membership of any member if they have good reason to believe that the person would be, or is, detrimental to the Campaign's aims. Any person thus denied membership shall have the right to appeal against the decision to OUSU. This appeal must be made in the first instance by contacting the VP Graduates, who shall then initiate an investigation by the OUSU Executive.

C. Open Meetings

C.1. At least **one** open meeting shall be held per full term. These shall be called by the Chair(s) and publicized by the **committee** at least one week in advance. All Executive Officers have an obligation to attend open meetings, unless their absence is wholly unavoidable, in which case they should send their apologies to the Chair(s).

C.2. All issues to be discussed must be received by the Chair(s) at least three days before an open meeting to be included on the agenda. The Chair(s) shall circulate the agenda to all members at least one day before an open meeting.

C.3. The Chair(s) shall preside over open meetings. **If the chairs cannot attend the meeting, he/she must inform the committee and arrange for another executive to take over the presiding role. The general order of the meetings must be compiled and sent out a day before the open meetings.**

C.4. Each member has one vote in open meetings. Voting is by simple majority, unless specified otherwise in the Constitution. **If there is a tied vote, the Chair(s) will have the casting vote.**

D. Executive

D.1. The Permanent Executive of the Campaign shall consist of the following officers: Chair or Co-Chairs, Treasurer, **Secretary, Sponsorship Officer, Social and Publicity Officer**, Welfare Officer, and Publicity Officer. In addition, the Permanent Executive may elect Temporary Executive Officers, when appropriate to fulfill the aims of the Campaign.

D.2. Qualifying for Executive Membership

Executive Officers must be elected from members of the International Students' Campaign.

D.3. Term of Office

The term of office of any member of the Permanent Executive is between Michaelmas Term-Trinity Term, and for any member of the Temporary Executive one term. Any member may stand for the same position more than once.

D.4. General Duties of all Executive Officers

- a. All Executive Officers have an obligation to attend open meetings and executive meetings, unless their absence is wholly unavoidable, in which case they should send their apologies to the Chair(s).
- b. The Secretary shall keep minutes of all meetings. These will be stored on the OUSU server.
- c. All Executive Officers shall be responsible for updating their job descriptions when necessary.
- d. All Executive Officers are volunteers and cannot be paid for their work for the International Students' Campaign. They may, however, be recompensed for all expenses incurred through fulfilling their responsibilities, on production of receipts to the OUSU account administrator. Expenses should be checked with the Treasurer beforehand.
- e. The Executive shall jointly organize speakers, discussion meetings or other social and welfare events in the interest of international students.

D.5. Specific Duties of Permanent Executive Officers

The following is a non-exhaustive list of the duties and responsibilities of the Permanent Executive.

a. Chair or Co-Chairs

- i. To call elections, and chair executive meetings and open meetings,
- ii. To be responsible for the upholding of the Constitution,
- iii. To be responsible for the general coordination of all Campaign activities,
- iv. To attend OUSU Council meetings as the voting representative of the Campaign,
- v. To work closely with the Campaigns Officer on taking motions to OUSU Council, when appropriate,
- vi. To keep the VP Graduates informed of all major decisions.
- vii. To represent the Campaign within and outside the University of Oxford.

b. Treasurer

- i. To keep the Campaign accounts,
- ii. To report the status of accounts to the Executive at executive meetings,
- iii. To implement a protocol for financial issues,
- iv. To produce an account of all expenditure and activities and to bid for funds for the next academic year to the VP Finance by Friday, 5th week of Trinity term,
- v. To authorize the expenditure of Executive Officers, all expenses must be first approved, by a unanimous vote, of the Executive.

c. Sponsorship Officer

- i. To organize the fundraising activities of the Campaign, and work closely with OUSU's business manager (business@ousu.org) to foster long-term sponsorship relationships with other organisations.
- ii. To draft an events list for the up-coming term, including the aim of each event and targeted sponsors, and submit the document to OUSU's business officer by the end of previous term.

c. Secretary

- i. To maintain the membership list,
- ii. To minute all meetings and circulate copies of the minutes to members,
- iii. To publicize meetings and elections at least one week in advance,
- iv. To compile a term report from Executive reports and submit it to the VP Graduates by end of 10th week each term,

d. Social and Publicity officer

- i. To organize social events, if necessary with the help of a sub-committee organized and chaired by the Social Secretary,
- ii. To liaise with Common Rooms and national interest societies for joint events.
- iii. To work closely with the Social Secretary, Welfare Officer and Campaigns Officer on raising awareness of events organized by the Campaign,
- iv. To design and distribute publicity materials for Campaign events,
- v. To maintain the Campaign web-presence.
- vi. To moderate the Campaign's groups on social networking sites such as Facebook.

e. Welfare Officer

- i. To organize events pertaining to welfare issues for members, if necessary with the help of a Welfare Committee organized and chaired by the Welfare Officer,
- ii. To offer members information and advice relating to welfare and to ensure members are aware of resources and opportunities for them within and outside the University of Oxford,
- iii. To work closely with the Campaigns Officer to raise awareness of welfare issues for international students,
- iv. To liaise with the other OUSU equal opportunities campaigns.

f. Campaigns Officer

- i. To liaise with the Chair(s) on taking motions to Council, when appropriate,
- ii. To draft motions and policy statements for the Campaign,
- iii. To organize the activities for campaigns, proposed and carried in open meetings, by members,
- iv. To attend OUSU Council meetings with the Chair(s).

D.6. Executive Meetings

- a. The Chair must call at least four executive meetings per full term. All Executive Officers have

an obligation to attend executive meetings, unless their absence is wholly unavoidable, in which case they should send their apologies to the Chair(s).

b. The Chair(s) shall preside over executive meetings. If the chairs cannot make it, he/she must inform the committee and arrange for another executive to take over the presiding role. The agenda of the meetings must be compiled and sent out a day before Executive meetings.

c. Any member of the Executive can place an item on the agenda by emailing the Chair in advance. The Chair shall circulate the agenda to all Executive Officers at least one day before an executive meeting.

d. Each Executive Officer has one vote in executive meetings. The quorum for voting at an executive meeting is five Executive Officers. Voting is by simple majority, unless specified otherwise in the Constitution. If the vote is tied, where a motion or agenda item enjoys the support of the Chair(s), it shall be carried.

e. The Secretary shall take minutes of executive meetings and circulate them to all Executive Officers, no later than five days after a meeting.

E. Elections

E.1. All Permanent Executive Officers shall be elected.

E.2. Timing of Elections

Annual elections for all Executive positions shall take place in **Trinity term**. If an Executive Officer resigns before the end of the term to which he/she was elected, a by-election must be held to elect a replacement. A by-election may be held any time during full term.

E.3. Returning Officers

There shall be two Returning Officers responsible for the conduct of elections. A candidate in an election cannot act as a Returning Officer for that election. Returning Officers must be members of the Campaign. **The Returning Officers shall be the two individuals from the previous committee.**

E.4. Notice of Elections

The Secretary shall publicize elections at of the beginning of Trinity Term of the opening of nominations on Friday, 4th week of Trinity term.

E.5. Procedure for Elections of the Permanent Executive

a. The process for elections shall begin with the opening of nominations on Friday, 4th week of Trinity term. Nominations should include the name of the candidate, the position for which he/she wishes to stand. Nominations must be received by one or both Returning Officers no later than Friday, 4th week of Trinity Term.

i. Candidates may nominate themselves.

ii. No candidate may stand for election to more than one position in an election.

b. The Returning Officers shall notify members of the list of candidates and the date for hustings, no later than the Sunday following the deadline for nominations. Hustings shall be chaired by the Returning Officers and held by 8th week of Trinity term in an open meeting of the Campaign.

- c. Balloting shall open on Monday, 7th week of Hilary term and close on the following Friday.
- d. After balloting closes, the Returning Officers must count the votes in the presence of the **VP Graduates**. The candidate winning a majority of votes is elected. Members must be notified of the result within 24 hours of the close of balloting.
- e. If no candidates are nominated for a position, by-elections must be held no later than 2nd week of the **following MT**.

E.6. Handover

New Executive Officers shall start their terms at the end of TT with full hand-over in 8th week TT. The new Executive Officer shall receive a full handover document from their predecessor, no later than one week after the start of their term.

F. Motions and Campaigns

- F.1. Motions must be submitted in writing to the Chair(s) at least three days in advance of an open meeting to be included on the agenda. Any member may submit a motion. Motions shall be included in the agenda, which the Chair(s) shall circulate at least one days in advance of an open meeting.
- F.2. Campaigns may be proposed in a motion.
- F.3. Amendments may be proposed to a motion, amended motion or proposed amendment.
- F.4. Voting on motions, except on special motions, is by simple majority.
- F.5. Special motions must be carried by a two-thirds majority. The following motions must be submitted as special motions: a motion to amend the Constitution, a motion of no confidence in any Executive Officer.

G. Miscellaneous

- G.1. If there are any disputes or complaints, an appeal must be made in the first instance by contacting the VP Graduates, who shall then initiate an investigation by the OUSU Executive.

APPENDIX D - Castle Mill Accommodation

Background Information

Oxford University's Castle Mill development, on Roger Dudman Way at the southern edge of Port Meadow, has been widely criticised, both for the damage which it has done to the character of Port Meadow and for a number of irregularities in the planning process. A motion has been submitted to OUSU Council, proposing that the Council should condemn the University's handling of the development and should seek answers to a number of questions about it. This document sets out relevant background information and makes a case for voting in favour of this motion.

What happened?

- 2010-2011: The University begins negotiations with the council concerning development on the site. The University has planning permission, dating from 2002, for 517 units. The planning permission states that no new buildings should exceed four storeys in height and that a contamination survey should take place prior to any building work.
- 7th November 2011: The University submits a new application for planning permission, this time for 312 units in eight five-storey buildings. In the application, the University states that the site is not adjacent or near to important habitats or biodiversity features and that the site is not contaminated or suspected to be contaminated. The application also stated that the new buildings 'would not be visible from the majority of Port Meadow'.
- November 2011: A contamination survey by the Environmental Scientifics Group concludes that the site requires remediation before it would be compliant with laws governing the habitation of contaminated sites.
- 21st December 2011: The University submits additional images to the planning application, showing its effect on long-distance views. These images indicate that the effect of the buildings on the Meadow will be minimal.
- At some point (the Council have note specified when) the University makes amendments to the originally submitted application. A report on these amendments, including revised assessments and images of the effect of the development on Port Meadow, is submitted to the West Area Planning Committee in February. These include a lowering of the height of the buildings by 1.2m.
- 27th January 2012: The City Council's Heritage Officer, Nick Worlledge, submits a damning report on the originally proposed development, criticising its height and concluding that "there is no justification for this harm". The report is not shown to members of the West Area Planning Committee on the grounds that it referred only to the un-amended plans.
- 15th February 2012: The City Council's West Area Planning Committee gives planning permission for the development.
- September 2012: Work begins on the development.
- December 2012: The Campaign to Protect Port Meadow is launched.
- 17th December 2012: A meeting of the City Council is held in response to a petition containing more than 1500 signatures condemning the Castle Mill Development. Following the meeting, Councillor Alan Armitage writes to Toby Porter, from the Campaign to Protect Port Meadow, stating that some councillors felt that the wool had been pulled over their eyes during the planning process.
- 7th February 2013: In response to the public meeting held in December, the Head of City Planning submits a report on the Castle Mill development to the West Area Planning Committee. The report supported the decision to award planning permission. The committee decides to negotiate with the university to mitigate the impact of the development.
- 12th February 2013: A letter from Paul Goffin, Director of Estates for the University, to Richard Lawrence Wilson, a private individual who had complained to the Vic Chancellor about the development, states that "The University has acted in good faith throughout

this process, and in line with all the proper procedures as laid down by the relevant authorities for all the planning and building phases of the project”.

- 17th April 2013: The West Area Planning Committee votes unanimously to send a letter to the University outlining concerns about the Roger Dudham Way application. Members of the Committee commented that ‘The University’s response has been inadequate’.
- Late April 2013: The University pays for sixty trees to be planted on the south edge of the meadow to screen the development. Some of these are immediately damaged by livestock.
- 11th May 2013: The Campaign to Protect Port Meadow, in conjunction with the Campaign to Protect Rural England, launches an application for Judicial Review, the first stage of a full legal challenge.
- 30th May: local MP, Nicola Blackwood gives her support for a Judicial Review

Criticisms

- Absence of an Environmental Impact Assessment. Large or intrusive developments can require an Environmental Impact Assessment. Oxford City Planning Officers Murray Hancock and Michael Crofton-Briggs stated that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required as ‘this is not a sensitive area and impact can be mitigated’. As Port Meadow is a Scheduled Ancient Monument and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, the judgement of the Planning Officers has been questioned.
- Contamination. The University stated that the site was not contaminated or suspected to be contaminated. The University ignored the planning condition requiring it to prove that the site was safe for use prior to the beginning of the development. It has not yet produced convincing evidence that the site has been adequately decontaminated
- Aesthetic impact. The buildings are visible from the majority of Port Meadow and have been heavily criticised for their negative effect on it. Attempts to screen them with trees are unlikely to be effective, as the buildings are considerably higher than the tree-line and are visible through the trees during winter months. The buildings also obstruct views of St Barnabas’ Church in Jericho and the skyline of central Oxford, thus contradicting the Council’s Local Plan 2001-2016, which states that the skyline of Oxford is ‘vulnerable to insensitive intrusions’ and is ‘fundamentally important to Oxford and must be protected’.
- The suppression of the Heritage Officer’s report (see above).
- Spurious reduction of height (see above).
- Lack of advertisement. Notifications of the development were not placed on the Meadow, where people could have seen them. The Campaign to Protect Port Meadow has also alleged that the University has made incorrect statements about which interested and relevantly concerned parties had been consulted.
- Biodiversity. The University’s planning application stated that the development was not adjacent to or near important habitats or biodiversity features. This is questionable, as the development is near Port Meadow, the Oxford Canal, the Thames, and Burgess Field Nature Reserve, all of which are important habitats and biodiversity features.

The University’s Response

- Statement of having acted in good faith (see above)
- Tree planting (see above)
- Statement (May 2013) regarding soil contamination on the site
- The University is reported by Oxford City Council (2nd June, 2013) as being in negotiations about mitigation and landscaping

Why OUSU Council should care

- Because the University has failed to answer accusations made against it and to act in a transparent manner

- Because the University has failed in its responsibility to conserve the natural and built environment of Oxford
- Because the Castle Mill development has exposed the University to considerable public criticism and has severely damaged its relations with the people of Oxford
- Because the lack of response by students of the University has damaged relations with the people of Oxford
- Because without criticism from OUSU, the University can purport to be representing students' interests in the Castle Mill development
- Because it has still not been demonstrated that the site is adequately decontaminated for occupations by students, especially those with families.

Gabriel Roberts
Worcester College