

Council Minutes

7th Week Trinity Term 2015

7th Week Council took place at 5:30pm prompt, on Wednesday 10th June 2015, at Christ Church, Blue Boar Lecture Theatre.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, please feel free to contact the Chair, Nick Cooper, 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 the Sabbatical Officers
- f. Reports from the Executive Officers and the Divisional Board Representatives who wish to make reports
- g. Questions to members of the Executive and the Divisional Board Representatives
- h. Report from the Scrutiny Committee
- i. Report from the Returning Officer on the Trinity Referenda
- j. Emergency motions
- k. Passage of motions without discussion
- l. Motions of No Confidence or censure
 1. Motion of No Confidence against Leonie Davidson (Part Time Executive (PTE) Mature Students Officer)
 2. Motion to Censure against members of the Executive and Divisional Board Representatives for failing duties to attend Council
 3. Motion to Censure against members of the Executive for failing to provide reports to Council
 4. Motion to Censure against members of the Executive and Divisional Board Representatives for non-compliance with the Scrutiny Committee
 5. Motion of no confidence in Alex Walker, former Returning Officer, Trinity Term 2014
- m. Motions to amend Bye-Laws, General Regulations or Election Regulations
 6. Final Reading of Amendments to General Regulations
 7. Final Reading of Amendments to Election Regulations
- n. Motions authorising expenditure
 8. Dignity Drive
 9. Escapade Funding Motion
- o. Other motions
 10. Re-Introduction of Mi-Voice
 11. European Union
 12. Future of OUSU Council
 13. Levelling the playing field in the Careers Service
 14. Postgraduate Access
- p. Any other business
 1. Online Accessibility Presentation

2. RAG Accounting Practice
3. Oxford Hub

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

No issues were raised with the minutes.

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 – Jack Matthews (University) nominated.

Hust requested.

Jack Matthews – Informed council that it would be a great honour for him to be chair of council one more time, explaining that he had done it twice in the past, and that people know his feelings on the importance of this political body within student life. Stated that he would ensure meetings were efficient with maximum clarity. Added that OUSU has an incredibly important general meeting next term, an event of legal significance, and as someone who was part of drafting the rules five years ago, he would very much like to be a part of that now. Explained his plans to hold the meeting in the Sheldonian, and his intention to invite the new Vice-Chancellor to attend and ask questions.

Minerva Lim (Keble) – Stated that the chair of council requires a highly organised individual. Added that in her capacity as International Students' Officer, she had worked with Jack, she has found it difficult to get in touch with him, has not received responses to numerous emails, and has now discovered that the International Students' Fair has been cancelled. Asked Jack if this would carry over into the role of chair of council.

Jack – Responded that on the specific matter of the International Students' Festival, he intended to deal with in his personal report to council, and noted an apology regarding this available in his written report. Acknowledged that he wasn't perfect, but that the issue is much more nuanced than that, and that there were external issues which simply could not be overcome, having come into the position late in Hilary Term. Claimed that his record as the Chair of Council stands strong, and that he will ensure that the agenda is always out before the weekend, and is advertised adequately.

Jenny Walker (Wadham) – Asked if, considering that Jack had been chair of council twice

previously, and that OUSU has difficulty engaging new students, if it would be better to have someone else as chair.

Jack – Agreed that we need to engage new students and noted that those who read the initial document online will know that there was another candidate. Explained that he has spoken to that candidate before council, as he is very sad that they pulled out. Added that he did a lot when chair, was unsure if someone else would run, and thought with the particular significance of the next general meeting, this is something he really wanted to do.

Jack – 54
RON – 23
SBV – 1

Jack Matthews was elected.

Undergraduate Medical Sciences Divisional Board Representative – Raj Dattani (St Peter's) nominated.

Hust requested.

Raj Dattani – Introduced himself as a fourth year medical student, and the current undergraduate medical sciences div rep. Explained that he believes he has achieved in the role, having delivered £20,000 funding for a new app by the BMJ, and having forced the division to consult when they wanted to change their admissions criteria. Informed council that he wants to keep delivering, particularly having just had the GMC review of the medical school where a number of issues were raised which he believes he can hold the medical school to account on. Added that going into the future, he has already had meetings with the head of division regarding setting up a gym.

Hossein Sharafi (Keble) – Stated that he encouraged someone from his college to run for this role, who contacted you for more information over a week ago. Explained that having not received the further information which he required, he decided not to apply for the role. Asked if this was not inappropriate, considering the fact that Raj was re-running.

Raj – Responded that he has had no such email, but that he has had significant issues accessing the allotted institutional email address. Added that he did speak to a member of Lincoln who wanted to run, and provided him with a two-page summary of what should be done in the role, and cc'd the Vice President for Access and Academic Affairs, so it is completely on record.

Alastair Graham (St John's) – Explained that he is a member of the scrutiny committee and that they submitted an email to him to which they never received a response. Noted that he had alluded to email problems, but that these had not been communicated to them. Added that he had not attended council or submitted apologies, and therefore had a motion of censure pending against him in this council. Asked why he had chosen to attend now, having missed so many previous meetings.

Raj – Answered with two comments, one being that he has not received the emails referred to, and one quoting the previous scrutiny report: “most impressive, is how much consultation Raj performs. Overall, we are very much pleased by the work Raj does, and we hope he continues this great work.” Argued that his record on delivery speaks for itself. Added that the reason he has not been attending council meetings is because he has been up in the JR doing the work required of him as a medical student.

Raj – 44
RON – 26
SBV – 8

Raj Dattani was elected.

Undergraduate MPLS Divisional Board Representative – Jack Langley (LMH) and Greg Auger (St John’s).

Greg Auger – Explained that a while a div rep is very important, they need to ensure that they are not working alone, stating that if elected, he would make sure he worked with departmental reps, course reps, OUSU sabbs and OUSU council. Informed council that he is both experienced and competent, and as his JCR’s Academic Affairs Officer he won extended opening hours at the St John’s library, has ran academic feedback sessions, and having been here for three years, he understands the issues facing Oxford students. Added that this summer, he persuaded the University to fund putting the Alternative Prospectus online.

Joe Smith (Somerville) - Informed council that Jack Langley sent his apologies to council and read out information from his nominations form:

“I am a chemist and therefore study the required subject. I’ve had experience representing my peers on the joint consultative committee and therefore know the common issues and best ways of getting people’s views. I also believe in getting student’s views heard and this is a fantastic way of doing that.”

Jack – 6
Greg – 63
RON – 2
SBV – 7

Greg Auger was elected.

Graduate MPLS Divisional Board Representative – Jacob Page (S Catherine’s) nominated.

No hust requested.

Jacob – 70

RON – 2
SBV – 6

Jacob Page was elected.

Undergraduate Humanities Divisional Board Representative – Duncan Shepherd (Balliol) nominated.

Hust requested.

Duncan Shepherd – Informed council that he cares a lot about education and students, and that he already has a lot of experience, as the current JCR President of Balliol. Added that he has sat on numerous committees and believed he is very good at actually putting forward the concerns of students, and is happy to be fairly forceful where needed. Stated that he will be in his fourth year, so has seen a lot of changes already, and what he would really now like to work towards is clearer guidelines on expectations for student workloads.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Asked what his plans were for carrying forward the work on student workloads.

Duncan – Answered that he has ran through existing findings and wants to look at how to get departments to talk to each other, but is still looking at general ideas.

Duncan – 66
RON – 6
SBV – 6

Duncan Shepherd was elected.

Undergraduate Social Sciences Divisional Board Representative – Claire Paulus (Keble) nominated.

Claire – 66
RON – 3
SBV – 9

Claire Paulus was elected.

Graduate Social Sciences Divisional Board Representative – Chris Jacobi (Nuffield) nominated.

No hust requested.

Chris – 70

RON – 0

SBV – 8

Chris Jacobi was elected.

Womens' Campaign Officer - Stephanie Kelley (Regent's) nominated.

Stephanie Kelley – Recognised that she is a new face to council, but that her experience for this role comes from work which she did in the US, for a non-profit organisation called InterAct as an administrative assistant on the crisis team for an agency that handles cases of domestic violence and sexual assault, from the age of 15 to 17. Stated that there are so many issues that freshers will have to face at University which they have not yet faced before, and that this experience will help her to work with them. Aimed to plan events centered around contraception, around sexual consent, and making sure that there is an influx of discussion-based events for freshers to attend.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Asked for ideas which specifically involve graduate women, particularly as there is not currently a Graduate Womens' Officer in place.

Stephanie – Replied that WomCam have recently elected a woman named Lucy Walters, who is a graduate student, and right now they are tentatively organising panels around womens' issues that specifically might affect graduate students more so than undergraduates, such as women in academia. Added that they are looking to set up panel talks for women to speak about their experiences in an intimate and safe environment.

Aliya Yule (Wadham) – Asked what work she had done with WomCam this year.

Stephanie – Answered that during Trinity Term, she was elected the publicity officer, and most recently ran the 5th Week Free campaign, on Facebook, Twitter and Tumblr. Urged people to look at the article on this, which would be coming out in the Cherwell later in the week. Added that she has also been renovating the website.

Stephanie – 55

RON – 4

SBV – 19

Stephanie Kelley was elected.

Environment and Ethics Officer – Fairlie Kirkpatrick Baird (Somerville) and Bethany Currie (Corpus Christi) nominated.

Bethany Currie - Introduced herself and stated that she wanted to be OUSU's E & E Officer as she has already done a lot of relevant work in Corpus, including setting up their first annual environment week, and working on divestment, however urged that she is keen to do work pushing change within the wider university as well. Stated that if elected, she would hope to engage freshers in her term in office, encourage students to support the local community and businesses, work on ethical consumption of food and look into food waste in colleges.

Fairlie Kirkpatrick Baird – Introduced herself as a first year historian with an awful lot of experience in environment work in Oxford, including her roles as the E & E rep in her college, the Environment

and Sustainability Coordinator at the Oxford Hub, Schools Coordinator and active volunteer at Teach Green, co-founder of Oxford Climate Society and VegSoc, Speaker Coordinator for the 2015 Oxford Climate Forum, as well as her involvement in the divestment campaign, with Green Impact, and with Student Switch-Off. Added that due to this involvement, she is very aware and connected with all the environmental groups in Oxford. Noted that there has been a lot of recent success with divestment, but that there is a lot more to be done, and that in addition to work on this, she would like to promote vegetarianism and veganism as environmentally sustainable diets, both using Veggie Pledge and veggie options in hall. Stated that she would like to make a guide on being sustainable as a student which she hopes would be really helpful to those students interested in sustainability but don't really know how to get started.

Ruth Meredith – Noted that both candidates seem to be super busy already, and asked if they will actually have time to commit to the role.

Fairlie – Answered that she recognises that this role it is a big one, and that if she were to be successful this, along with her role as college E & E rep, would be her main priority.

Bethany – Answered that she liked being really busy and she has wanted to be on the OUSU part time executive for a long time. Added that she would be very passionate in the role, and is already working on these issues anyway.

Fairlie – 40
Bethany – 32
RON – 2
SBV – 4

Fairlie was elected.

3 Positions for Steering Committee – Matthew Collyer (New) nominated.

No hust requested.

Matthew – 66
RON – 3
SBV – 9

Matthew Collyer was elected.

2 Positions for Internal Affairs Committee – Jia Wei Loh (Keble) nominated.

No hust requested.

Jia – 68
RON – 0

SBV – 10

Jia Wei Loh was elected.

Scrutiny Committee Member – Jacob Williams (Exeter) nominated.

No hust requested.

Jacob – 63

RON – 9

SBV – 6

Jacob Williams was elected.

e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers

Anna Bradshaw (Wadham) – Urged council to read her written report, as there is not time in her oral report to cover the work she has done throughout the year, but it might be useful to see the various elements of her role beyond those that are known by council. Thanked Sam, Aliya and Zuleyka for being wonderful part-time executives, thanked Eden and Tiana for chairing It Happens Here, and thanked everyone who she had collaborated and worked with over the previous year. Summarised that it had been an amazing and exhausting year, and that she was really happy to be handing over to Lucy.

Ruth Meredith (Brasenose) – Thanked all the chairs of the campaigns which she worked with over the year for being phenomenal in their roles, and for reminding her why she wanted to be a sabb in the first place. Noted that she has achieved far more than is included in her scrutiny report, and urged council to read her written report for further information. Informed council that she is most proud of creating landscape change in living wage, and working with students who have become leaders over the year. Recognised that her role is often seen as fluffy, and being the icing rather than the cake, however disagreed strongly with this idea. Stated the things which the c and c role does is at the core of the students experience; they stop people dropping out, they make students into whole people, and they are also deeply political. Reminded council that filling gaps in homeless provision is political, taking a stand on climate change is political, and collecting food for food banks is political, because it says that the state is not doing enough and is not good enough. Urged students to work towards change and to be a part of making things better for Oxford and for people.

Jack Matthews (University) – Began with an apology, explaining that yesterday OUSU had to make the difficult decision of cancelling the International Students' Festival, something which usually takes place in Hilary Term, which was impossible as he only took the position up at the end of 7th week in Hilary Term. Noted that while it was a good thing that they attempted to hold it in Trinity Term instead, they were up against diminished costs, as the Vice-Chancellor was no longer funding the event, and the only venue that was available did not confirm until a few weeks ago.

Accepted full responsibility in spite of these issues, as the event was on his shoulders. Added that he would be making a report to his successor to ensure that the same things do not happen again. Informed council that the big issues which he would like to see continued that he has started, are the Student Consultation Benchmark, work analysing the student barometer results, and the provision of this to common rooms, and new work on postgraduate access. Concluded that this position has been a great honour, one that he thought he would never have the opportunity to do, and thanked everyone who has supported him.

James Blythe (Brasenose) – Informed council that it has been his enormous pleasure and privilege to be their Vice President for Access and Academic Affairs for the last year. Explained that it is a role which is not starting something from scratch, or often finishing things, it is rather rolling the boulder a little further up the hill. Acknowledged great predecessors who rolled that boulder on issues like suspended status students, feedback on exams, curricular, and student representation, stating it has been an honour to continue that work, and leave the boulder further up the hill than when he started. Stated that he left confident that in Cat, he has a great successor. Noted that his role is not necessarily a sustainable one in the future, particularly considering how strongly students care about access, claiming that access may need to be a role which is separated out from education, something which will be considered over the following years.

Chris Pike (St Edmund Hall) – Informed council that this week is testimonial week with Mind Your Head, and encouraged people to get involved. Flagged his report, noting that it is separate to the booklet, but that copies are available.

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Performed a song to Council summarising his year in office.

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

Jenny Walker (Wadham) - Apologised for forgetting to submit a written report and explained that she had been very busy with work.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Noted that it had been a while since he had reported to council and apologised for that, explaining that he is a clinical medical student, and therefore required to be at the JR until around 7pm at night. Reported that a bid had been submitted to Nuffield Hospitals Trust for £25,000 for a BMJ best practise app, that he had been involved in plans to set up a gym for medical students in the JR, forced the Medical Science Committee to respond to the VP Access and Academic Affairs feedback proposal, which they were keen to avoid reporting back on, and had worked hard to set up a graduate entry course review.

g. Questions to members of the Executive and the Divisional Board Representatives

Chris Casson (St Catherine's) – Reminded officers that just over a year ago he came to council with an idea for an online suggestion system at OUSU, and asked if there had been any progress on this.

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Confirmed that OUSU now has a suggestion box on the website, and explained that this is accessible from the home page, and any student can leave a suggestion once they have logged in.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Asked if Raj thought it would be good to have a non-clinical student in his role in the future.

Raj – Agreed that this would work as well as a clinical student, however stated that he has worked closely with the VP Access and Academic Affairs to keep him informed of the work he is doing, as he views him as what would be equivalent to a line manager in a professional capacity.

Hossein Sharafi (Keble) – Asked if email access has been a problem for most OUSU officers, as the OUSU emails are the ones advertised on the website, and this is problematic if this is the case.

Ruth Meredith (Brasenose) – Acknowledged that OUSU's emails are notorious for having regular problems, but if officers let us know, then OUSU will make all efforts to fix the problem that day.

h. Report from the Scrutiny Committee

Benji Woolf (Christ Church) – Explained that it is the time of the year where Scrutiny Committee present their report to council, and that this report will be the final one for the outgoing sabbatical officers and divisional board representatives. Stated that the committee feel that most sabbatical officers have done an excellent job, and have served students exceptionally well, adding that within a limited number of words, the committee have attempted to cover their work in a suitable breadth and depth, noting that they cannot cover absolutely everything that officers have done, and asking individuals to be mindful of this. Clarified that as Scrutiny Committee, they have a legal duty not to write anything defamatory, hence meaning that we will not write anything which is not based on evidence. Reported that they believed that Louis has done a very good job in his role, and has done a lot of work communicating OUSU, that James has worked extremely hard to ensure good student representation, and everyone has positive things to say about him, that Anna has done an excellent job promoting serious issues on behalf of women, and her work has been exemplary, that Ruth has been effective in her role and a venerable member of the team, that Jack has been a great asset to the team, and his eagerness to represent students is admirable, and that Chris has made better progress than last term, but the committee would like to have heard more positive things about his communication with the team. Added that they consider the communication breakdown which occurred within the team has not been helpful, and naturally this has strained personal relations. Informed council that the job of scrutiny this term has been a difficult one, and the overall conclusion is that some officers have clearly been able to do more than others.

Raised a concern that not all div reps have been attending council as they should have been, and that not all of them responded to scrutiny, adding a concern that a number of div reps reported a clear feeling of dissatisfaction, with one stating that they had not had enough support from OUSU, and another who felt that the role should not necessarily be a part of OUSU. Praised those who took the role very seriously, and encouraged the new div rep team to engage properly with OUSU.

Reported that the committee was generally pleased with the work of the part-time executive, but that a couple appeared to have fallen short of their duties. Noted that two members resigned in 5th week, with another resigning at the start of this week.

Explained that the report itself is split into three sections, one with sabbs, one with PTE, and one with div reps, adding that sabbatical officers were interviewed twice, and all others were

interviewed once, either in person or via email. Summarised that the report aimed to recognise the achievements of OUSU as a team, as well as the shortcomings, and that it was hoped to be constructive to the OUSU team and the student community. Thanked OUSU for being accommodating, the other members of Scrutiny Committee, and Ami, Democratic Support Officer.

Anna Bradshaw (Wadham) – Asked the committee to comment on their decision to write out any mention of Zuleyka in her section of the report, where her other PTE were discussed.

Benji – Explained that the committee decided to take this out in the final draft, as Zuleyka was no longer a member of the PTE.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Asked how the committee decided who would have face to face interviews and who would have email interviews.

Benji – Answered that this was a time constraint issue, as the other members of the committee had exams this term, and he consequently did most of the interviews, but did not have the time to do them all. Added that all officers were offered a face to face interview if they preferred, something which no one requested.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Asked if the committee would consider it prudent to revert to the officer's nexus account, if they are not receiving a response from their OUSU account.

Benji – Answered that he was not informed that anyone could not access their OUSU emails, so he used only those.

Christina St Clair (St John's) – Asked when the committee began compiling their report and how long they gave officers to respond.

Benji – Answered that he had originally intended to allow them a week and a half, however he misremembered the deadline. Stated that they still had a week, and some people were able to answer within five minutes.

Jenny Walker (Wadham) - Stated that students are obviously very busy at the end of term, so questioned if it was fair to only allow a week for people to respond.

Benji – Replied that the same tight schedule was used as last term, and that it would not have taken more than 20 minutes to respond. Recognised that he could have added to the email that officers that are struggling should let the committee know. Noted that a number of them had an out of office set up informing them that they were in the middle of finals.

Alastair Graham (St John's) – Asked the chair of scrutiny if he would agree that it was fantastic that some individuals who had finals managed to respond to us, and that it is commendable that nearly all officers responded to us.

Benji – Agreed that it was fantastic.

Christina (St John's) – Asked if it is the committee's responsibility to keep check on officers throughout term, and to prod people if they have missed one report/meeting.

Benji – Answered that to his understanding, they are not meant to prod people throughout term.

Alex Chalmers (Oriol) – Asked if the committee agree that if officers are struggling to access their OUSU emails accounts, they should let someone know, rather than sitting back and then complaining a few weeks later.

Benji – Agreed and noted that no email problems were raised with scrutiny at any point.

Anna Bradshaw (Wadham) – Explained that there is an option to refer the report back to Scrutiny Committee, asking them to go back to do it again, and do it better, and offer everyone face-to-face interviews. Proposed that this is the best option, and that the report should not be outright rejected, as they did do a lot of work and it is useful for some people, particularly, the general conclusions about the team are constructive. Urged for council to vote for a re-write of the report to come to council in the first week of Michaelmas.

Objection received.

Alastair (St John's) – Pointed out that the Scrutiny Committee has operated in the 5th week of term, and noted that this has been the case before he began at Oxford. Re-iterated an earlier point made that if officers know that their emails are not working, this can be fixed within a day. Added that all officers were offered a face-to-face report. Confirmed that the committee spent many many many hours working on the report, making it as good and as thorough as possible. Recognised that the report cannot include every single thing that every officer has done throughout their term, as this would run to reams and reams of paper, and they needed to be mindful about length. Stated that if an officer had problems, they would have hoped that they would have been in touch with the committee.

Vote to refer the scrutiny report back to the committee for further consideration:

For – 26

Against – 22

Abstain – 27

Procedural motion passed. The scrutiny report was referred to Michaelmas Term.

James Blythe (Brasenose) – Proposed tabling motions 1 – 4 to 1st week Michaelmas Term, suggesting they should be seen at the same time as the report.

Objection received to tabling those that do not relate to the scrutiny report. Proposed that only motion 4 is tabled.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Clarified that council would be vote on tabling motions 1 – 3, and would then hold a separate vote on tabling motion 4.

James Blythe – Stated that it is becoming part of the same thing, and should be considered when there is a report and everything can be taken seriously.

Objection received.

Benji – Stated that for those that are not related to scrutiny, all that was done was a check of whether officers are doing what they are mandated to do, so a referral of the report is no reason to table these.

Vote to table motions 1 – 3 to 1st week council, Michaelmas Term:

For – 26
Against – 22
Abstain – 27

Procedural motion fell.

Jacob Williams (Exeter) – Objected to tabling motion 4, as if this is left for another term, it would no longer be a current or relevant issue. Added that the issues will be so far in the past, no one will be bothered about the motion.

Vote to table motion 4 to 1st week council, Michaelmas Term:

For – 38
Against – 9
Abstain – 20

Procedural motion passed.

i. Report from the Returning Officer on the Trinity Referenda

Joe Smith (Somerville) – Announced a brilliant turnout of 8671 in the recent referenda. Directed students to the report on the referenda, available both in the booklets and online. Stated that they had received fantastic publicity, with the leader of ‘Save Subfusc’ and the VP Women even appearing on Newsnight. Reported that the referenda delivered a result in which the students of the University can have confidence. Urged people to run to be his successor in Michaelmas. Thanked Will Obeney and Nick Cooper, the two Chairs of Council which he worked with, as well as Ami, Democratic Support Officer.

j. Emergency motions

None.

k. Passage of motions without discussion

10. Re-introduction of Mi-Voice

Council Notes:

1. Mi-Voice was withdrawn as a voting system used by OUSU at the end of Trinity Term 2014.
2. This change meant that many colleges were left without an easily accessible voting system, a situation that has created inconvenience for many colleges.
3. The new OUSU budget gives provision for the introduction of a voting system for Common Room elections, which would be paid for but not administered by OUSU and which all College Returning Officers would have access to.
4. Elections are great!

Council Believes:

1. OUSU has a duty to support colleges and the Common Room Support Officer has worked hard to ensure that colleges feel well-supported, and both he, the Returning Officer and other OUSU Officers have heard concerns and queries from College Returning Officers about a reliable voting system.
2. MSL (the central system for OUSU elections) works great for cross-campus votes, where full integrity is needed, but given the nature of the data fed into it, it is not suitable for in-college votes.
3. Common Rooms shouldn't have had to go a whole year without a voting system that is free and supported by OUSU.

Council Resolves:

1. Take out a subscription to Mi-Voice that all Common Rooms can access and that will be funded by OUSU but that will be the job of all Common Room Returning Officers (or equivalent) to maintain.

Proposed: Joe Smith (Somerville)

Seconded: Joe Reason (Wadham)

Motion passed without discussion.

12. Future of OUSU Council

Council Notes:

1. The results of the survey on Council (Appendix 4).
2. That the rules on Council have not been reviewed for many years.

Council Believes:

1. That Council should represent all Oxford students.
2. That in terms of rules and of practices, Council should be structured in such a way to ensure all students' voices can be represented, and that all students can influence the work of their Student Union.

Council Resolves:

1. To accept the report (Appendix 4) by the Chair of Council.
2. To mandate the Sabbatical Officers-elect to review the rules and practices of Council, and report back to Council no later than 7th week, Michaelmas Term 2015.
3. To discuss after this motion, for a suggested time of no longer than fifteen minutes, the outcomes of the Council survey, and generally how Council operates.
4. To encourage a maximum speech length of 60 seconds for this discussion, and encourage the acting Chair to allow as many people as possible to speak.
5. To allow the current Chair of Council the final speech in this discussion, provided he shuts up for the rest of the debate (unless answering a direct question quickly).

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Cat Jones (Pembroke)

Motion passed without discussion.

14. Postgraduate Access

Council Notes:

1. The important work that OUSU has done around undergraduate access, most noticeably through the Target Schools campaign.
2. That the Government is currently formulating new policy on postgraduate study support.
3. That myths about life as a student at Oxford aren't confined to undergraduates.
4. That while advances are being made in University funding for postgraduate study, the endowment would need to increase by another ~£2 Bn for the University to be able to fully support all graduate students through their studies.

Council Believes:

1. In a world where more students need a graduate qualification to get the job they aspire to, OUSU should be working to make a postgraduate degree as accessible as possible.
2. We have rightly prioritised our undergraduate access work on certain groups who are currently underrepresented and experience barriers in accessing higher education. However these barriers do not disappear after an undergraduate education, and this important work should continue, where appropriate, at all levels of the educational system.
3. That for too long, the idea of postgraduate access has not had the prominence it deserves.
4. That it is time for OUSU to put extra effort into the issue of postgraduate access.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the VP Access and Academic Affairs 2015/16 and VP Graduates 2015/16 to include postgraduate issues within the upcoming OUSU Access Vision project.
2. To support the plans of the VP Graduates and Graduate Academic Affairs Officer, working with other OUSU Officers, to produce a Postgraduate Access website to act as a graduate alternative prospectus.

Proposed: Jack Matthews (University)

Seconded: Marina Lambrakis (St. John's)

Motion passed without discussion.

Katherine Pangonis (St Peter's) – Requested that motion 9 is moved to the top of the agenda.

No objection.

9. Escapade Funding Motion**Council Notes:**

1. Escapade Magazine is a fashion & travel magazine based in Oxford that does editorials in different countries around the world working with students and professionals from a wide variety of universities and backgrounds.
2. It is a small independent magazine working hard to give students the opportunity to work creatively at a professional level and co-operate with other students around the world.
3. It invites contributions for both travel & fashion photography from students at oxford, and also general interest articles.
4. The first issue was shortlisted for an OUSU student award
5. It is run by two oxford students and distributes in Oxford and at London universities.

6. It is non-profit and has currently not raised quite enough funds to cover printing costs. The magazine is ready to go and just awaiting funds.
7. Many JCRS have already subscribed
8. This issue features:
 - a. Photoshoots in Singapore & Paris and travel photography for Marrakech; the standard of the photography is very high.
 - b. Feature articles on the links between social media and depression in young adults, veganism in fashion, and the systematic suppression of some cultural and ethnic groups in Singapore.
 - c. An in-depth and exclusive interview with Claire Wilcox, curator of the much hyped 'savage beauty' exhibition at the V&A.
 - d. Travel guides and travel writing for Marrakech, Paris & Singapore, written by students for students.
 - e. STA travel discount codes which will be really useful for readers with an interest in travel.

Council Resolves:

1. To provide £200 to support & subscribe to this issue of Escapade Magazine.

Proposed: Katherine Pangonis (St Peter's)

Seconded: Daniel de Lisle (St Hugh's)

Katherine Pangonis – Explained that she is asking council for funding for Escapade, a fashion and travel magazine which she began last term. Stated that the second issue is now ready and that she hoped it would appeal to a wide variety of people. Explained that it contained photo shoots from lots of different places, including Singapore and Paris, with accompanying articles, and general interest articles on topics such as depression, social media and veganism. Added that it is with the printers and ready to go, but that £200 funding was still needed.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Asked if she considered this a worthy thing to be doing.

Katherine – Answered that yes, she did consider it a worthy thing to be doing.

Will Obeney (Regent's) – Asked if there was a long-term plan for funding.

Katherine – Responded that to come to OUSU was not the plan, and for the first issue, they had a great person working on marketing who raised all the funds through advertising, however she is not here now, and the person taking her place bailed on the magazine very close to the deadline, having previously said the work had been done. Hoped that it would be sustained by advertising in the future.

Lindsay Lee (Wadham) – Asked if the magazine featured non-white, non-able bodied, non-skinny people.

Katherine – Answered that there are non-white people in the magazine, but that they are all currently able-bodied and probably skinny. Noted that this is not an ideal that they are trying to promote, but is rather just the people they have worked with so far.

Motion passed with no opposition.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Requested that the two motions of censure are moved above motion 1.

Objection received.

Raj – Suggested that a motion of no confidence would take longer than censures, and that it would be prudent to move on swiftly.

Procedural motion fell.

I. Motions of No Confidence or censure

1. Motion of No Confidence Against Leonie Davidson (Part Time Executive (PTE) Mature Students 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. A Motion of No Confidence means a proposal to remove from office an individual as per Bye-Law 17.
3. Bye-Law 17.4 which states that “A Motion of No Confidence in a Part Time Officer must be passed, by a two-thirds majority vote, in each of two successive Ordinary Meetings of Council. A Motion of No Confidence in a Part Time Officer must be passed, by a two-thirds majority vote, in each of two successive Ordinary Meetings of Council.”
4. That the Scrutiny Committee do not bring such a motion lightly.
5. Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer) has failed to respond to the Scrutiny Committee’s request for answers to Scrutiny questions, failed to attend or submit apologies to two or more Executive Council meetings and failed to give reports to over two OUSU Council ordinary meetings this term.

Council Believes:

1. Elected officers should be held to account where they do not perform their duties adequately.
2. That Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer) has not lived up to the expectations that OUSU Council has for its elected officers.
3. Officers who fail to meet even the most basic of requirements of the position are not suitable to continue in that role.

Council Resolves:

1. To pass this motion of no confidence in Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer).

Proposed: Benjamin Woolf (Christ Church)

Seconded: Alastair Graham (St John’s)

Alastair Graham (St John’s) – Introduced the motion of no confidence as being completely unrelated to the scrutiny report. Highlighted notes 5 and stated he is happy to relax the reference to the failure to respond to scrutiny committee, but that failure to attend or submit apologies to the executive or to council or to submit reports are all required of the officer. Highlighted that if you cannot attend either meeting, all you have to do is send a brief email apologising, and that a report

can be written and submitted prior to council, or given during the meeting. Stated that he actually had no idea what Leonie had done, if anything, and that if we cannot no confidence an officer for failure to fulfil even the most basic of requirements, he had severe doubts about what the no confidence was actually for.

Will Obeney (Regent's) – Asked if there was any evidence that the officer has being doing anything outside of the requirements.

Alastair – Responded that he has no evidence of this.

Jack Mathews (University) – Noted that he has not been as outreaching as he should have been with this member of the executive.

Christina St Clair (St John's) – Asked Alistair to elaborate on notes 4, “that the Scrutiny Committee do not bring such a motion lightly.”

Alastair – Explained that scrutiny would like to be able to praise and commend the work of all of the officers, noting that the fact that this is not taken lightly is because these motions are rarely put to council, and we would not bring it unless it was an exceptional circumstance, and we felt that it was absolutely appropriate. Added that scrutiny did not want to be viewed as doing this frivolously.

Move to vote.

Motion passes with no objection.

Nick Cooper (St John's) - Noted that it requires readings in two councils for a motion of no confidence to actually take effect, so this motion will be debated again in 1st week Michaelmas.

2. Motion to Censure Against Members of the Executive and Divisional Board Representatives for Failing Duties to Attend Council.

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 and Divisional Board Representatives to attend Council meetings or send apologies should this not be possible.
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 Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer), Raj Dattani (Divisional Board Representative Medical Sciences Undergraduate) and Kristin Schmidt (Divisional Board Representative Medical Sciences Postgraduate) have all failed to attend at least two ordinary Council meetings this term and not offered apologies for them prior to the meeting.

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 Executive Officers and Divisional Board Representatives have a duty to attend ordinary Council meetings or apologise in advance where this is not possible.
2. That Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer), Raj Dattani (Divisional Board Representative Medical Sciences Undergraduate) and Kristin Schmidt (Divisional Board Representative Medical Sciences Postgraduate) have all failed in their duties to attend Council or send apologies if this is not possible,

Council Resolves:

1. To remind the Executive and Divisional Board Representatives of their duties to attend ordinary OUSU Council meetings.
2. To censure Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer) for failing to attend or apologise for failing to attend or send apologies for two or more OUSU Council ordinary meetings.
3. To censure Raj Dattani (Divisional Board Representative Medical Sciences Undergraduate) for failing to attend or send apologies for two or more OUSU Council ordinary meetings.
4. To censure Kristin Schmidt (Divisional Board Representative Medical Sciences Postgraduate) for failing to attend or send apologies for two or more OUSU Council ordinary meetings.

Proposed: Benjamin Woolf (Christ Church)

Seconded: Alastair Graham (St John's)

Alastair Graham (St John's) – Stated that attending OUSU Council is something which all elected officers should strive to do, as it is where motions of substance are discussed, where points are raised and debated, and is essentially the forum for democracy. Added that the importance of attending council is exactly why it is set out in policy, noting that this motion is beyond their control, as scrutiny are mandated to censure officers who fail to attend council.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Agreed with much of what Alastair said in many respects but proposed that clause three was stricken from the motion. Recognised that he may not have always followed the exact correct procedure for submitting apologies, but that he has made relevant sabbatical officers aware when he cannot attend. Argued that this censure provides an inaccurate reflection of his work, and that to censure someone with such a strong record of delivering would be putting the cart before the horse. Re-iterated the success he has had in the role which he outlined earlier in the meeting.

Amendment received:

To strike Resolves 3 from the motion.

Proposed: Raj Dattani (St Peter's)

Seconded: Ruth Meredith (Brasenose)

Objection received to amendment.

Alastair – Acknowledged that what Raj has achieved as a div rep is good, but urged that this motion is not about that, but is about fulfilling your mandate to attend council. Reminded council that Raj himself recognised that he had not followed the procedure, and that it is simply not acceptable. Urged council to detach the two separate issues.

Move to vote on amendment.

Objection received.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Encouraged council to move to a vote as there are still many important things to discuss that are likely not to receive sufficient time if this continues.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Stated that she had a very important question, which she wanted to ask.

Eden Bailey – Retracted her move to vote.

Eden Tanner – Asked if the div reps were given any guidance about this mandate, as it is not fair to censure them if they did not know that they were going to be censured.

Raj – Stated that this was not explained.

Benji – Claimed that ignorance is not an excuse, and if you take on a role, you have a duty to find out what is expected of you adding that regardless of what other work is being undertaken, you are not doing your job if a part of it which is mandated is not being done.

Alastair – Noted that in OUSU policy, it is specifically mentioned that the president must send the policy to everyone making them aware of these mandates.

Move to vote.

Objection received.

David Parton (St Hilda's) – Stated that we have heard everything that is relevant.

Will Obeney (Regent's) – Asked to hear the answer to the previous question.

Will - Retracted objection, if he can have an answer during summary speeches.

Alastair – Noted that Raj mentioned earlier that he informally spoke to sabbs to tell them that he could not attend council, therefore suggesting that there is knowledge of the duty to attend council.

Stated that this is a basic duty, and it is simple to submit apologies if it is not possible. Urged that ignorance should not be allowed as an excuse and encouraged council to consider the example that they would be setting to future members of the executive and the divisional boards. Summarised that this is a procedural point that must pass if we are to uphold policy.

Raj – Informed council that this motion is a case of procedure above substance, and if they wanted to go around judging everyone on procedure then so be it, but warned that it would be a bad move for OUSU.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – Requested a secret ballot.

Objection received to this.

Marina – Urged that secret ballot would be a better and more accurate way of voting in this case.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) – Reminded council that they are representatives, and we should keep proceedings as transparent as possible so people can be held to account by their constituents.

Vote on secret ballot.

Vote fell.

Vote on amendment to remove resolves 3:

For – 32

Against – 16

Abstain – 16

Amendment passed.

Anna Bradshaw (Wadham) – proposed a move to a five-minute break.

Objection received.

Anna – Explained that this meeting is very tiring and many people would benefit from a break before we continue to discuss important issues.

Vote on adjournment for five minutes.

Passed.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Proposed reducing speeches to 60 seconds.

No opposition.

Move to vote on motion as amended.

No objection received.

Alastair – Reminded council that Raj is no longer on the motion so urged council to at least pass the remaining elements of the motion.

Vote:

For – 37

Against – 4

Abstain – 2

Motion passed as amended.

3. Motion to Censure Against Members of the Executive for Failing to Provide Reports to Council.

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 provide reports to two ordinary meetings of Council.
4. That Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer) and Daniel Waldman (PTE Rents and Accommodation Officer) have both failed to submit reports to 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 members of the Executive Committee is to report their work to Council.
2. That Council should hold officers who do not report their work to Council to account.
3. That Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer) and Daniel Waldman (PTE Rents and Accommodation Officer) have both failed in their duties to report to OUSU Council ordinary meetings.

Council Resolves:

1. To remind the Executive and Divisional Board Representatives of their duties to provide reports to ordinary OUSU Council meetings.

2. To censure Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer) for failing to provide reports to two or more OUSU Council ordinary meetings.
3. To censure Daniel Waldman (PTE Rents and Accommodation Officer) for failing to provide reports for two or more OUSU Council ordinary meetings.

Proposed: Benjamin Woolf (Christ Church)

Seconded: Alastair Graham (St John's)

Alastair Graham – Pointed out to council that there was a booklet available which contains all the reports that have been submitted by officers, explaining that these reports crucially outline the work that the executives do. Explained to council that executive officers have the option to submit written reports, or can turn up to council and provide a verbal report, if they have not had the chance to write one in advance.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Read out a message from Danny, explaining that he is unable to make council today, but he is very happy for this motion of censure to pass, and if he were here he would vote in favour of it.

Move to vote.

Vote:

For – 37

Against – 10

Abstain - 2

Motion passed.

4. Motion to Censure Against Members of the Executive and Divisional Board Representatives for non-Compliance with the Scrutiny Committee.

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. That the Executive and Divisional Board Representatives have a duty to cooperate with the Scrutiny Committee so that the Scrutiny Committee may compile its termly report.
3. 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.
4. That Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer) and Raj Dattani (Divisional Board Representative Medical Sciences Undergraduate) failed to reply at all to Scrutiny's e-mails to them.
5. That Zuleyka Shahin (PTE Graduate Women's Officer) failed to check her e-mails and respond to the Scrutiny Committee until the afternoon of the final deadline, following a reminder two days earlier. The reply was short, offered no explanation or apology and simply said that she couldn't answer the questions until four days later. The Scrutiny Committee replied strongly suggesting that she complied and an extended deadline was offered into the early evening which was ignored.

6. That all OUSU Executive and Divisional Board Representatives are obligated to use their OUSU e-mail addresses to conduct OUSU business and are supposed to check them regularly as well as respond to the e-mails that they receive so that they can properly represent students.
7. That all officers were reminded to respond two days before the deadline and were warned explicitly that disciplinary action would result if the questions were not answered.

Council Believes:

1. The Scrutiny Committee should be understanding in its dealings with OUSU officials, but that without any communication at all it is difficult for the Scrutiny Committee to do their work.
2. That officers should be checking their e-mails regularly and that if they are facing exceptional circumstances that they have a responsibility to say this quickly in a reply or put an out-of-office notice on (as one Part Time Officer had) so that any e-mail which is sent to them produces an explanation mitigating a slower response.
3. That the officers who did not offer any reply at all to Scrutiny failed in their duties.
4. That Zuleyka Shahin (PTE Graduate Women's Officer)'s response was inadequate and that she failed in their duties.

Council Resolves:

1. To remind the Executive and Divisional Board Representatives of their duties to present themselves to the Scrutiny Committee and respond to their communications.
2. To censure Leonie Davidson (PTE Mature Students Officer) for failing to respond at all to the Scrutiny Committee.
3. To censure Raj Dattani (Divisional Board Representative Medical Sciences Undergraduate) for failing to respond at all to the Scrutiny Committee.
4. To censure Zuleyka Shahin (PTE Graduate Women's Officer) for failing to respond adequately to the Scrutiny Committee and not checking her OUSU e-mail account regularly.

Proposer: Benjamin Woolf (Christ Church)

Seconder: Alastair Graham (St John's)

Motion tabled to 1st week OUSU Council, Michaelmas Term, 2015.

5. Motion of no confidence in Alex Walker, Former Returning Officer, Trinity Term 2014

Council Notes:

1. That following the NUS Referendum in Trinity Term 2014, the result was overturned by the Junior Tribunal, following the discovery that the ballot had been rigged.
2. That we are unaware of the progress of the Proctors Investigation into this matter.
3. That the rigging of the Referendum was brought to light through the important oversight of students on the processes running our elections and referenda.

Council Further Notes:

1. That Alex Walker, Wadham College, served as Returning Officer in Trinity Term 2014, up to the point of his resignation on 25/5/2014. Alex Walker has also resigned his membership of OUSU.
2. That on 30/4/2014, Alex Walker gave a direction that only the Returning Officer would be able to attend the count, contrary to normal practice. This was overturned following protest from the

Leader of the No Campaign.

3. That during the Referendum, Alex Walker removed the Democratic Support Officer's access to the online ballot system. This was quickly noticed, and access restored.
4. That Alex Walker generated ~1400 more voter codes than there are registered students in the University. Common practice is to generate ~200 spare voter codes.
5. That data provided by Mi-Voice shows that these voter codes were used to systematically rig the Referendum result, with these fraudulent votes representing over 30% of the total votes cast.
6. That in verbal accounts made within the OUSU Offices, Alex Walker claimed to have made a copy of the spare voter codes on a USB Pen Drive, and that he has lost this USB Pen Drive. Putting this data on a USB Pen Drive is contrary to normal practice, unnecessary, and raises questions about his commitment to the secrecy of the ballot.

Council Believes:

1. That those associated with rigging the Referendum should be held to account, and also be seen to be held to account.
2. That it is disappointing that the Proctors' investigation has not been more expeditious. The lack of a resolution from the Proctors has diminished the reputation of the Proctors in the eyes of students as we are yet to receive justice.
3. That this case shows the importance of students scrutinising their own democratic processes, and that proper, open oversight is essential for our elections and Referenda.
4. That democratic principles are the bedrock of how our Student Union operates, and are essential for it to legitimately represent students on the important issues we wish it to.

Council Further Believes:

1. That as a minimum, Alex Walker's actions and decisions as Returning Officer allowed for the defrauding of the electorate.
2. That Alex Walker's behaviour was improper, anti-democratic, and unscrupulous – betraying the responsibility he had been given to serve Oxford students as their Returning Officer.

Council Resolves:

1. To have no confidence in Alex Walker, Wadham College, the Former Returning Officer, Trinity Term 2014.
2. To mandate the President to communicate the views and wishes of Council herein expressed to the Proctors, noting that Council still wish for the Proctors to resolve this important issue.

Proposed: Jack J. Matthews (University)

Seconded: Will Obeney (Regent's Park)

Jack Matthews (University) – Noted that it will be tricky to do this justice in 60 seconds but that he is happy to answer any questions. Stated that it gives him no satisfaction to bring this motion, but that he does it out of a belief that council is the guardian of our democratic values, and we cannot remain silent. Explained that he tried to bring this in Hilary Term, but due to a procedural issue in no way related to the motion content, a complaint was filed, which delayed the motion until the end of this term. Directed to the failings of the former Returning Officer, outlined in the notes of the motion. Informed council that this motion is not an assertion of who took positive decision to rig the referendum, but is a motion holding to account someone who we trusted to administer our elections, yet who enabled our democracy to be corrupted.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Asked where the proctors' investigation is at.

Jack – Answered that it is on going.

Raj – Asked if anyone knew how long it would take.

Jack – Answered that he personally, in his personal opinion, had no confidence that we would ever hear anything about it.

Alex Chalmers (Oriol) – Explained that he had a comment to read out from a member of his JCR: “He clearly bungled the job, and knowingly or unknowingly, intentionally or unintentionally, enabled the referendum to be rigged, but to bring a motion of no confidence over a year after he resigned, not only from his position as RO, but also from his membership of OUSU, strikes me as unnecessary and done out of malice rather than the pursuit of justice.”

Move to vote.

Vote:

For – 38

Against – 2

Abstain – 15

Motion passed.

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

6. Final Reading of Amendments to General Regulations

Council Notes:

1. Appendix 1 written by Internal Affairs Committee to summarise the proposed amendments.
2. The rolling governance review conducted over the past two years.
3. The Bye-Law changes passed in 1st week TT15 and the need for consequential amendments to the General Regulations.

Council Resolves:

1. To give a final reading to the changes to the General Regulations outlined in Appendix 2.

Proposed: Louis Trup (Brasenose)

Seconded: Chris Pike (St Edmund)

AMENDMENT

To add to the motion “Amendments to General Regulations”:

Council Notes:

4. That trans representation within the university is limited to two trans reps in the LGBTQ Society, a trans working group in the OUSU LGBTQ Campaign and a trans rep on the Women's Campaign Committee
5. That Council mandated its future NUS delegates to vote in favour of a full time trans officer role for the NUS
6. That trans people face problems with administration, healthcare, and discrimination which differ from other liberation groups
7. That cis gate keeping of services is one of the predominant limitations trans people face in accessing treatment they deserve

Council Believes:

1. That the trans community has specific needs which cannot accurately be represented by a cis LGBTQ officer
2. That lots of trans campaigning is policy based (e.g. gender neutral toilets, college trans policy, transition fund), requiring focused work that goes beyond the role of the LGBTQ officer
3. That having a PTE trans officer would make an important statement to both NUS and the country as a whole about trans people deserving to represent themselves
4. That it is appropriate that the role should be open to trans students only

Council Resolves:

2. To amend the General Regulations outlined in Appendix 2 as follows:
 - a. In General Regulation 2.1, replace "20" with "21";
 - b. In General Regulation 2.2, after "Student Parents and Carers Officer", on the next line, insert: "Trans Officer".
3. To set the remit for the Trans Officer as given in Appendix 5

Proposed: Jessy Parker Humphreys (Jesus)

Seconded: Rowan Davis (Wadham)

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Discussed motion 7 to pass the final reading of changes to the Election Regulations alongside this. Noted that there was an amendment and that he was happy to take it as friendly, providing there was no objection to it.

No objection received to the amendment.

Louis – Explained to council that they are voting to get through the new Election Regulations and General Regulations.

Move to vote.

Motion passed with no opposition.

7. Final Reading of Amendments to Election Regulations

Council Notes:

1. Appendix 1 written by Internal Affairs Committee to summarise the proposed amendments.

2. The rolling governance review conducted over the past two years.
3. The recommendations of the Election and Referendum Review Group (ERRG) reported to 5th week council Hilary Term 2015.

Council Resolves:

1. To give a final reading to the changes to the Election Regulations outlined in Appendix 3.

Proposed: Louis Trup (Brasenose)

Seconded: Chris Pike (St Edmund)

Motion passed alongside motion 6 with no opposition.

n. Motions authorising expenditure

8. Dignity Drive

Council Notes:

1. The work of a number of student campaigners, many of completed OUSU's *Make Change Happen* training programme, on the Oxford Dignity Drive, working to increase access to sanitary products for homeless people in Oxford.
2. That Oxford Dignity Drive raised £1200, and will use these funds to buy sanitary products that they will supply to homeless services in Oxford.
3. OUSU's commitment to working to support homeless people in Oxford, most notably through the On Your Doorstep campaign.
4. OUSU's other work around improving access to sanitary products, including the Free Periods pilot scheme earlier this term, and the Period Match function within this scheme that provides sanitary products to homeless people in Oxford.
5. That the government places a 5% luxury tax on sanitary products.
6. That there is £535 remaining in the Council Discretionary Fund for the rest of the 2014-15 academic year.

Council Believes:

1. Sanitary products are a necessity, and all people (including students and homeless people) should have access to them.

Council Resolves:

1. To support Dignity Drive's purchase of sanitary products by subsidizing their purchases to cover the 5% luxury tax on these products with £63 from the Council Discretionary Fund.

Proposed: Niamh McIntyre (Wadham)

Seconded: Anna Bradshaw (Wadham)

Amendment received:

To change Notes 2 to:

That Oxford Dignity Drive raised £2100, and will use these funds to buy sanitary products that they will supply to homeless services in Oxford.

To change Resolves 1 to:

To support Dignity Drive's purchase of sanitary products by subsidizing their purchases to cover the 5% luxury tax on these products with £110 from the Council Discretionary Fund.

Proposed: Anna Bradshaw (Wadham)

Seconded: Rita Nissim (St John's)

Niamh McIntyre (Wadham) – Explained that they organised a project called the Oxford Dignity Drive, where they collected sanitary products and raised money to buy sanitary products to be donated to shelters in Oxford and Oxfordshire. Added that they are in a position where they are about to make a large order, and this money from OUSU would absorb the tax on the products and enable them to buy more.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) – Asked if council is able to contribute more money than that which is requested.

Nick answered that they could amend the motion to do so, stating that there is currently around £330 left in the discretionary budget.

Annie – Asked if the money rolls over to the following academic year.

Nick – Answers that it does not.

Amendment received:

To add resolves 2:

“To further support Dignity Drive with all remaining funds in the OUSU Council discretionary fund.”

Proposed: Anna Bradshaw (Wadham)

Seconded: Annie Teriba (Wadham)

No objection to amendment.

Motion passed as amended with no objection.

o. Other motions

11. European Union

Council Notes:

1. That following the election of a Conservative government, it seems certain that there will be a referendum on the United Kingdom's continuing membership of the European Union in either 2016 or 2017.
2. That at its 5th week meeting in Hilary Term 2015, it gave its support to the inclusion of EU membership in OUSU's General Election Manifesto.
3. That the European Union is a very significant funding body for the University.

Council Believes:

1. That students benefit enormously from the funding for academic research provided by the European Union.
2. That the University benefits enormously from the easy presence of students from other member states of the European Union at Oxford.
3. That Britain should remain a member state of the European Union.

Council Resolves:

1. To make 'Council believes 1-3' OUSU policy.
2. To mandate the Executive Officers, under the leadership of the Vice-President (Charities & Community) to raise awareness in the student body of the importance of voting in the referendum, as they did with great success in the run-up to the General Election 2015.

Proposed: James Blythe (Brasenose)

Seconded: Ruth Meredith (Brasenose)

James Blythe (Brasenose) – Explained that he and Ruth are bringing this motion with a double purpose; firstly to repeat the exercise of urging students to register to vote and have their voices heard in another important democratic decision, and secondly to take a position. Recognised that there will be some who say it is beyond council's right to do this, however, insisted that this would be a referendum which will have a huge impact on the University and on the student experience, and it is our job to take positions on important issues that affect students. Hundreds of millions a year of funding from the European Union goes into academic research at this university, adding that he estimated that it was about a 5th of their overall budget. Explained that it would be roughly equivalent to closing one of the four divisions, and would be cataclysmic for this University, especially for graduate research students, for us to leave the European Union.

Dan Turner (Balliol) – Asked if the second resolve implied that the VP C&C would simply encourage people to vote, or if they would encourage people to vote in a particular way.

James – Answered that his view would that we would not want to combine the two, and should just encourage people to use their right to vote.

Amendment received:

Add believes 4:

“That there is a diverse range of reasonable opinion about the EU amongst the student body, and that every effort must be made to facilitate debate and ensure that those who hold opinions different to OUSU's are not demonized or shut out of the debate.”

Add resolves 3:

“To mandate the whole exec to do everything in their power to encourage free debate about the EU, and not to prevent or oppose, or refuse to facilitate the holding of debates, or hosting of speakers who do not share OUSU’s views on the EU.”

Amend resolves 1 to include making ‘believes 4’ OUSU policy.

Proposed: Chris Casson (St Catherine’s)

Seconded:

Chris Casson – Explained that he does not like this motion, as he is Eurosceptic, but accepted that his opinion will be a minority in the room, and is very happy for the motion to pass on that basis, as well as the fact that it already passed last term. Urged council to consider his amendment, which ensures that he and others are not shut out of debates and demonised for having different opinions. Stated it is important that those who do not agree with this policy still have speaking rights, and that debates/speakers are not cancelled if they are people that do not agree. Summarised that it is basically a free speech style amendment.

Amendment taken as friendly by proposers.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) – Asked about the implications of the amendment, and asked if it would purely be to prevent shutting people down if they are Eurosceptic, or if it would prevent the shutting down of openly racist comments.

Chris – Answered that this is about not shutting down Eurosceptics.

No objection to the amendment.

Objection received to the motion as a whole.

Jacob Williams (Exeter) – Reminded council that many students think that OUSU is either a bad or irrelevant thing. Noted that he does not think that they are right in these views, but suggested that one reason for such opinions is that when council gathers to talk about matters such as this, it is seen as political posturing. Argued that regardless of whether or not students are eurosceptics, this is likely to form part of the very wide view that OUSU goes beyond its remit in taking a stand on issues, acting as though it has power to influence national policy. Suggested that this leads to disenchantment amongst students.

Move to vote.

Objected.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Stated that people already know how they are going to vote.

Anna Bradshaw (Wadham) – Answered that there has not yet been a chance to respond to the previous comment.

Eden – Retracted move to vote.

Anna – Argued that it is exactly our job to talk about issues that are on a national scale and affect students. Noted that James has made it very clear how this would affect higher education, and added that doing things like this is how we involve students who care about this. Urged council to

consider the graduate students whose funding would go, and explained that this is how we can engage with them. Re-iterated that this is precisely our job, as we are a fundamentally political organisation who have a duty to represent students.

Move to vote.

Objected.

Eden Tanner (St John's) – Argued that we have heard Anna's excellent justification, which she feels, sums it up.

Annie Teriba (Wadham) - Stated that this motion may still need another round of speeches in order for everyone to make up their minds.

Vote on move to vote:

For – 34
Against – 10
Abstain – 4

Passed.

James – Argued that the graduate students' funding which would be removed if we leave the EU would reject the suggestion that this is posturing.

Jacob – Stated that we haven't considered enough how policy would change on all levels if we left the EU, and that we need to consult on a wider level.

Vote:

For – 47
Against – 1
Abstain – 2

Motion passed.

13. Levelling the playing field in the Careers Service

Council Notes:

1. Oxford University Careers Fairs are held throughout the year in the Town Hall or Exam Schools.
2. Recruiters may join the 'Recruiters' Group' at an annual charge of £750 for large organisations, £250 for SMEs and free for NGOs. Membership yields a 20% reduction in the cost of attending fairs.
3. For the higher cost of £3500 (or £1200 for SMEs), recruiters can become 'Partners', halving the cost of attending fairs and allowing access to a database on student characteristics.
4. There is no obvious source of funding for travel to job interviews or for internships offered by the Careers Service. Some Colleges may offer such financial support, and Moritz-Heyman Scholars receive separate financial support.

Council Believes:

1. Recruitment is systematically biased towards large firms in certain sectors (finance, management consultancy) with substantial HR budgets.
2. Oxford students are accordingly deprived of access to, and information regarding, important but low-paying jobs, especially in social enterprises and the third sector.
3. Careers Service policy should aim to systematically extract resources from those firms capable of providing them, and use this to subsidise smaller and not-for-profit corporations.
4. Such a policy benefits students by increasing the supply of information and choice available, and more formalised travel subsidies will help poorer students in particular.
5. Such a policy benefits small and not-for-profit corporations by increasing their ability to recruit top graduates.
6. The Careers Service currently provides excellent quality support to Oxford students.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the President and Vice-President (Charities and Community) to lobby the University and Careers Service for reform of Careers Service funding to support both low-income firms in advertising to Oxford students and low-income students in having access to job opportunities.
2. To mandate the President and Vice-President (Charities and Community) to report back to OUSU Council in late Michaelmas Term 2015 on their progress.

Proposed: Daniel Turner (Balliol)

Seconded: Becky Howe (Pembroke)

Dan Turner – Explained that this was a motion of passion and was put together very quickly, mainly working from the Careers Service website. Added that the way things work at the moment, is that if you are a firm, you can become an associate member of the Careers Service, which gives you cheaper access to careers fairs, priority within publications etc. Noted that there is a waiver for non-profit firms, but there are still major financial barriers to these firms. Suggested that we should extract resources from companies that can afford this, and who currently receive too much coverage, and use that to subsidise small firms.

Ruth Meredith (Brasenose) – Asked if by low-income firms, he meant third sector firms, as she would not be interested small accountants etc.

Dan – Answered that he deliberately wanted to include small and medium sized firms in this, as he believes that there is a cluster of high-income firms that get disproportionate coverage. Noted that he is happy for it to be ambiguous so Becky and Emily can do what they will.

Motion passed with no opposition.

p. Any other business

Jack Matthews (University) – Asked to suspend the no clapping rule in order to thank Nick, Joe and Ami for their work this term.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Raised a second point of order to thank the sabbatical team by a round of applause.

1. Online Accessibility Presentation (Appendix 6)

Lindsay Lee (Wadham) – Explained that she had mandated herself to give this presentation, as accessibility is important and we are discriminating against disabled students when we do not make our online content accessible. Ran through the presentation with council, informing them that they need to ensure that online information can be read by a screen reader, that they caption pictures and videos, that they provide transcripts to videos, and that they organise content clearly. Added that if people are posting things that are not entirely accessible, they should be providing alternative formats. Urged people to email her with any questions or concerns.

2. RAG Accounting Practice

Ruth Meredith (Brasenose) – Explained that this will be really short but is really important. Informed council that RAG has elections in Hilary Term, and then the expectation, although it is not formalised anywhere, is that the new elected charities will have their fundraising begin in Trinity Term. Noted that this does not allow for the accounting year, which makes it so hard to work out exactly what charities get, and it means charities end up waiting 6 to 8 months for the money that has been fundraised. Explained that she has worked with OUSU's accountant to make sure that charities who are elected begin being fundraised for at the start of the financial year, which is the start of August, which will make things much clearer and much easier for the accounting team and for the RAG treasurer, as well as meaning the amount raised will be much more transparent, rather than having a 12 month wait while we work out what we raise. Clarified that no charity would miss out due to the change, but that the charities elected in Hilary 2014 would actually have an term and summer of fundraising

3. Oxford Hub

Ruth Meredith (Brasenose) – Explained that The Oxford Hub had part of their funding cut by the University about 12 months ago. Added that they did not do anything about this initially as they were new, and under the impression that they would find funding, however students began to approach OUSU for help, and approximately 3 months ago, OUSU came up with a support proposal for the hub, which constituted some administrative support and 2.5 staff time. Explained that the Hub rejected this offer so they were instead given the opportunity to come back to us with an alternative, however the proposal which they produced was something which would have been more work for everyone involved. Reported that they advised the Hub to take some more time to think, and asked them to come back with something else prior to the OUSU budget deadline, however communication broke down, and nothing came back. Added that internal work was also done by OUSU within the University, as we checked out where they could find funding, we spoke to the VC, and urged them to find money. Concluded that this has not worked so far but that she hoped people would continue to find a fix.

Louis Trup (Brasenose) – Reported that the VC explained that it was only ever a short term funding project, so he moved on to heads of house, who all gave a similar response that the Hub was

inefficient and not sustainable. Concluded that what needs to happen is a review about how long-term funding can take place, and once this was noted, they took a plan to the Hub to be carried out by a group of student consultancies. Advised that if the Hub bought into this, they could go back to the heads of houses with more weight to receive short-term funding. Informed council that the Hub also rejected this. Stressed that the student volunteers at the Hub are wonderful, and it is the managers that have been problematic, and have a problem with OUSU.

Raj Dattani (St Peter's) – Asked what is happening now and if it will fold.

Ruth – Responded that it is unclear, but that she did not think it would fold.

Louis – Stated that the Hub are still pursuing funding from colleges for the next year.

Benji Woolf (Christ Church) – Informed council that the scrutiny committee had drawn together a quick statement that explained that every officer was given an opportunity for a face to face interview, and that they could not re-interview every officer in the following week, and that a number of the officers were leaving the University this term. Reminded council that there was only three of them at the time of conducting scrutiny. Noted that the meeting today delegitimised scrutiny, and in the future they would push for a review of the formal role of scrutiny, given the results today. Concluded that when they pass the report, he will offer his resignation as the chair of scrutiny, and will sketch a fuller statement when fully caught up on University work.

Alastair Graham (St John's) – Reminded council that the role of scrutiny committee is very difficult, and that they are down a member, have two members with prelims and another with coursework. Informed council that they put together the best scrutiny report they could, and are concerned that it is reflecting badly on them that other people have failed to respond. Noted that they need to work with OUSU in the future to ensure that any email problems are fixed, so these reasons cannot be used again.