7th Week Trinity Term Council Minutes
TIME: 5.30pm
DATE: 7th June
LOCATION: St Catherine’s College, JCR lecture theatre

OUSU’s team will be filming elements of Council as part of a new marketing and communication plan to promote OUSU Council. If you are not happy to be filmed or would like to remain out of the footage please contact below. We aim to make Council as accessible as possible, and ensure that it is always in accessible venues. However, if there are any accessibility requirements that we are not meeting for yourself or others, please contact:

OUSU’s Democratic Support Officer, Josh O’Connor:
01865 611831 | dso@ousu.ox.ac.uk

a. OUSU Accounts, Budget and Affiliations
b. Minutes of the previous meeting
c. Matters arising from the minutes
d. Elections in council
e. Reports from and questions to the Sabbatical Trustees, Executive Officers, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (Raise and Give)
f. Scrutiny Committee Report
g. Items for resolution
   1. Review of Council & Relationship with Trustee Board
   2. Grads who Work Work Work Work Work Work
   3. Buy sleeping bags and clothing for homeless people in Oxford
   4. Diversity of OUSU’s Trustee Board
   5. Bop and Entz Themes (Amended Lapsing Policy)
   6. Advertising ban on LIFE (Amended Lapsing Policy)
   7. Motion to end the wearing of scholar’s gowns to exams

Below the Line*

8. Condemning UKVI’s Email Charge #FreeEmails
9. Make #pledgedecrim policy
10. Tigger Warning (Amended Lapsing Policy)
11. Living Wage (Amended Lapsing Policy)
12. Fairtrade Policy (Amended Lapsing Policy)

h. Items for debate
i. Any other business
Alex Curtis, Chair, explains there are many items on the agenda and therefore time limits will be set on items. Josh O’Connor, DSO, explains the new electronic voting system using an example. */

a. OUSU Accounts, Budget and Affiliations

b. Minutes of the previous meeting
c. Matters arising from the minutes

Alex Curtis, Chair: Questions on affiliations? None seen.
VOTE TO APPROVE AFFILIATIONS
For: 28 (100%)
Against: 0 (0%)
Abstentions: 10

Alex Curtis, Chair: For Council’s information; the budget. Any questions? None seen. Minutes from previous meeting; any comments? Any objection to the minutes? None seen. Any matters arising from previous minutes? None seen.

d. Elections in Council

Chair of Council - To serve for Michaelmas Term 2016.
Returning Officer - Oversees all elections, including any cross-campus by-elections and referenda, and all elections in council. To serve for Michaelmas Term 2016.
Deputy Returning Officer - Assists the Returning Officer in overseeing all elections, including any cross-campus by-elections and referenda, and all elections in council. To serve for Michaelmas Term

Steering Committee (x2) - Steering Committee is responsible for compiling the agenda for Council, and referring motions submitted to Council to other committees for preliminary discussions as and when needed. To serve for Michaelmas Term 2016.

Scrutiny Committee (x2) - Scrutiny Committee are responsible for carrying out an indept scrutiny of the Sabbatical Trustee’s work in line with the objective in the Rules of Council. To serve for Michaelmas Term 2017.

Beth Currie, RO: We have 4 elections in council today; returning officer, deputy returning officer, chair of council and a member of steering committee. Would anyone want to see a hust for RO? None seen.
ELECTION FOR RETURNING OFFICER
James Brennan: 27 (77%)
RON: 8 (23%)
Abstentions: 4
JAMES BRENNAN IS ELECTED RETURNING OFFICER
Beth Currie, RO: Would anyone like to see a hust for Deputy Returning Officer? None seen.

ELECTION FOR DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICER
Tabitha Ogilvie: 31 (94%)
RON: 2 (6%)
Abstentions: 3
TABITHA OGILVIE IS ELECTED DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICER

Beth Currie, RO: Would anyone like to see a hust for Chair of Council? Seen two.

Samuel Banks, Merton College: Hi, I’m Sam, in my third year studying Maths at Merton. I’ve been increasingly involved in OUSU and OUSU Council over the past year. I’m keen to engage productively to get the best possible student engagement and best student democracy we can. I have experience with handling procedural matters particularly in regards to my own JCR. I think I have the knowledge to operate council in the most effective way possible.

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: There’s a motion on the agenda which mandates the chair of council to do various things. If that passes will you be willing to take that on?

Samuel Banks, Merton College: Yes, I’m seconding the motion.

Dane Rodger, Merton College: Do you have any plans for the voting in Council? A lot of students feel ‘I can show up but I can’t vote so what’s the point?’

Samuel Banks, Merton College: As chair that wouldn’t be my responsibility. It is something we’ll explore in the review.

Beth Currie, Chair: Anymore questions? Seeing none.

ELECTION FOR CHAIR OF COUNCIL
Samuel Banks: 33 (89%)
RON: 4 (11%)
Abstentions: 2
SAMUEL BANKS IS ELECTED CHAIR OF COUNCIL

Beth Currie, RO: Would anyone like to see a hust for Steering Committee member? None seen.

ELECTION FOR STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBER
Jane Allen: 27 (84%)
RON: 5 (16%)
Abstentions: 8
JANE ALLEN IS ELECTED STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBER

e. Reports from and questions to the Sabbatical Officers, Executive Officers, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (Raise and Give)
Alex Curtis, Chair: Those giving verbal reports please come to the front you have 2 minutes each. Up to 8 questions.

Jack Hampton, President: My report is on how I found the whole year. Please read them. I’m going to explain my recommendations for OUSU in the future. 1. The students’ union needs to be more visible. 2. There needs to be more student opportunities. 3. Become the centre of student engagement. 4. Should be more fun. 5. We should be allowed to run for re-election. 6. Advocacy, a students’ union which doesn’t just lobby but acts like a trade union.

Orla White, VP Women: You can read my report online. Something I’d like to mention is the Central University Harassment Policy. It is something I’ve been working on across the year, the more students which engage in the crafting of it the better it will become.

Eden Bailey, VP AccAff: First thing I want to mention is guidance on student work load. Next unconscious bias training for admissions teachers. Class Act Campaign had their launch event with 200 people attending. Finally, thank you to the sabbs, OUSU and my friends for making this year possible.

Beth Currie, VP CC: I’ve been working on getting students involved in the general election. Get out and vote tomorrow. I’d also encourage you all to get involved in OUSU and make change.

Sandy Downs, VP WEO: I have only 3 weeks left so if you want to get in contact with me be quick and email me. I’d like to talk about what OUSU needs to do going forward. 1. Preventing Prevent. 2. We let students on years abroad down. 3. Work on our resources and signposting. 4. University mental health policy is mostly done and should be going round to common rooms next term. Thank you to sabbs, staff but mostly to you the students who do all the important work. Anything you need from OUSU please do ask.

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: Graduate engagement: ‘Grads make up 47% of the student body and yet they are routinely ignored’ is what I wrote in my manifesto and that is still true except grads are now 49% of the student body. OUSU needs to take on grad representation as a priority. We have to be an SU for every student. ‘Students for OUSU for change’ OUSU exists for you, it must consult you in everything it does. Our democratic structures are how you can directly tell us what it is you want. Protect your democratic rights, protect your say.

Jaycie Carter, Christ Church: I’m the co-chair of the Class Act Campaign. We started this year, 200 people came to our launch event, over 600 likes on facebook, an unprecedented number of applicants for our exec and lots of positive feedback. We’re planning on running lots of events and socials next year. We are going to run a survey as well next.
f. Scrutiny Committee Report

*/ Jonathan Wolstenholme & Joshua Clements introduce the scrutiny report /*

Alex Curtis, Chair: Any questions?

Jack Hampton, President: It’s a really good report, well done, it very well written. We take on board this criticism, we as a team haven’t had the scrutiny that was needed, but as first years you guys have done a very impressive job.

Harry Hatwell, St John’s: From the assessment you’ve made of this year’s sabb performance; what advice would you give to next year’s team?

Jonathan Wolstenholme & Joshua Clements, Scrutiny Committee: Hopefully they will read the report and get a good idea from that. Also to make the most of the handover week and learn what they can from this team. It’s hard to give advice because every sabb team is different. Our one piece of advice would be don’t give up.

VOTE TO APPROVE SCRUTINY REPORT
For: 36 (97%)
Against: 1 (3%)
Abstentions: 9
SCRUTINY REPORT APPROVED

g. Items for Resolution

Dane Rodgers, Merton College: Proceedural motion to bring motions 9 & 10 above the line. I have been mandated by my president to vote against motion 10 and would therefore like it above the line.

VOTE ON PROCEEDURAL MOTION TO BRING MOTION 9 ABOVE THE LINE
For: 9 (27%)
Against: 24 (73%)
Abstentions: 12
MOTION BROUGHT ABOVE THE LINE

VOTE ON PROCEEDURAL MOTION TO BRING MOTION 10 ABOVE THE LINE
For: 9 (26%)
Against: 26 (74%)
Abstentions: 7

MOTION BROUGHT ABOVE THE LINE
1. Review of Council & Relationship with Trustee Board

Council Notes:

1. That Council “represents the voice of students” and “acts as the representative channel for student opinion” (Article 9.1).
2. That Council also fulfils the important functions of scrutinising the work of elected officers, and setting policy to direct future work.
3. That Council “may from time to time make, repeal or amend Rules relating to Council’s functions and the proceedings and procedure of Council, its meetings and its committees” (Bye-Law 9.7).
4. The debate carried out at 5th week Trinity Term 2017 on the question ‘Should we reduce the number of Council meetings a term?’, where there was considerable discussion of the way Council runs and how this might be improved.

Council Further Notes:

5. That OUSU is a registered charity and is thus required to have a Trustee Board.
6. Article 23.3(f), which states that the Trustee Board must “submit a termly report of its work to Council.”
7. Articles 40.1 and 40.3, which state that the Board “must keep minutes of all resolutions... and proceedings”, and that these minutes “must be available to students on OUSU’s website.”
8. The motion brought to 1st week Trinity Term 2014 Council (available here: https://ousu.org/pageassets/representing-you/council/councilarchive/1st-Week-TT14-Council-Minutes.pdf), which passed without opposition, and in particular:
   a. Believes 3: “that... it is therefore a matter of regret that up-to-date minutes, reflecting all the discussions that took place at the Trustee Board, are not available on the OUSU website.”
   b. Believes 4: “that it is disconcerting that for many terms the Trustee Board has failed in its responsibility... to present termly reports of its work to Council.”
9. That the most recent minutes of the Trustee Board on the website date from 4th February 2016 (record of meetings available here: https://ousu.org/your-union/trustees/)
10. That the last time a termly report from the Trustee Board was brought to Council was 1st week Trinity Term 2015 (available here:
Council Believes:

1. That Council belongs to the members of OUSU.
2. That, as OUSU’s sovereign decision-making body, Council is, and should remain, in the driving seat as regards OUSU’s political direction.
3. That Council currently suffers from a lack of energy and dynamism, and is not well integrated with other structures of student representation, including Common Rooms, the course and Divisional Board representatives, and the OUSU Council Executive Committee.
4. That students have the right to know what decisions are being made on their behalf and in their name, and to input on these decisions where appropriate; Council is not simply a rubber stamp, but a forum for meaningful student engagement and decision-making.
5. That any review of Council should be overseen by student officers, so that the review and its findings are ultimately accountable to Council.
6. That the Trustee Board provides welcome guidance and strategic planning, conducive to the smooth and lawful running of OUSU.
7. That open and transparent communications between the Trustee Board and Council are vital, to ensure that the Trustee Board can be properly scrutinised and Council kept up-to-date on the Board’s activities.
8. That the relationship between Council and the Trustee Board appears to be a recurrent issue, given the motion referred to in Notes 8.

Council Resolves:

1. To review how Council runs and adopt the attached Terms of Reference (Annex 1) for this review.
2. To mandate the Chair of Council and the Steering Committee to oversee the review, enact the Terms of Reference, and report back to Council in a timely fashion with the review’s outcomes and recommendations for further discussion.
3. To mandate the Chair of Council to write to all Trustees, reminding the Board of their duties under OUSU’s Governing Documents and their responsibility to be open and transparent in their proceedings to all student members.
4. To mandate the current President as outgoing Chair of the Trustee Board, the Chair-elect of the Trustee Board (once they have been appointed), and the Student Trustees to consult with the Board and compile a report, to be
brought to 1st week Michaelmas Term 2017 by the Student Trustees, about how the Trustee Board could more effectively engage with Council in its decision-making.

Proposer: Marina Lambrakis, St John’s/OUUS

Seconder: Sam Banks, Merton

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: I wrote this motion after the debate in last Council on whether we should have fewer councils per term. This motion codifies that. It has extensive terms of reference for what the review should be looking at. Also to flag that it came to my attention the Trustee Board hasn’t been reporting to Council in the way it should have been. This has been a problem in the past so I’ve included a mandate for the Chair of Council to email the Trustees reminding them of their reports.

Alex Curtis, Chair: Any questions?

Tom Wernham, St Catherine’s: ???

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: That is part of it. Grad common rooms don’t meet as regularly as undergraduate so they don’t have chance to discuss motions there.

Lucas Bertholdi-Saad, Wadham: Why are the Trustee minutes not online?

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: I don’t know. I don’t know because there is a big gap they haven’t been updated since February 2016. It hadn’t been a problem in the past. We have had in the last year, to be fair, a lot of staff changes and the way that the Trustee Board was run changed quite a bit in terms of who takes the minutes and that kind of thing. So that could be part of the problem.

PASSED WITHOUT OPPOSITION

3. Buy sleeping bags and clothing for homeless people in Oxford

Council Notes:

1. That Turl Street Homeless Action (TSHA) is a student-run organisation which helps Oxford’s homeless by going on nightly shifts to distribute food and chat to them
2. That TSHA will not be able to help homeless people over the Summer vacation when most Oxford students are not around to volunteer
3. That TSHA has raised enough funds to buy food for the rest of the term, but not enough to make additional purchases of useful items for the homeless
4. That homeless people who TSHA speak to have spoken about their need for certain items such as warm clothing and sleeping bags
Council Believes:

1. That the reduction in voluntary work by TSHA over the Summer vacation should be compensated for by leaving our friends in the homeless community with some items that make rough sleeping more bearable
2. That TSHA can work out how best to spend the monetary donation, following research as to the most cost-effective and useful items to buy

Council Resolves:

1. To donate £600 to TSHA, to be spent on sleeping bags, warm clothing (coats, thermals, socks, underwear etc.) and flasks for homeless people in Oxford

Proposer: Laura Pole, Exeter College
Seconding: Alan Jiang, Jesus College

Laura Pole, Exeter College: I’m a VP of Turl Strett Homeless action. We hand out food and chat to homeless people in Oxford. We’re not here over the vacation to help out so we’d like to make purchases for the homeless to help them out. The motion doesn’t specify what we’d buy but it would be things like sleeping bags and warm clothes. I’d like to think everyone here is aware there is a problem in Oxford with homelessness and therefore would want to help out.

Dane Rodgers, Merton College: What is the OUSU discretionary fund?

Josh O’Connor, DSO: There is about £600 in the discretionary fund and it’s essentially a fund which Council can allocate to one off student projects or anything within OUSU’s objective that Council would like to support.

Lucas, Wadham College: If we don’t use all the fund what happens? If so should we not donate £600 instead?

Josh O’Connor, DSO: Yes it essentially is lost to Council if it is not spent.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO £600

VOTE
For: 40 (93%)
Against: 3 (7%)
Abstentions: 1

Council Notes:

1. That graduate students are unusually placed in the collegiate University, as they have the chance to undertake work while they are studying towards a
degree.

2. That data from the Student Barometer has consistently shown that postgraduate research students have relatively low satisfaction levels with the availability of teaching opportunities (around 70% in the 2016 data).

3. That the Vice-Presidents (Graduates) and (Charities & Community) for 2016-17 have been working on a project around the work opportunities available to graduate students in the collegiate University, focusing on two aims:
   a. to inform students of their rights and what they’re entitled to as workers
   b. to equip and empower students who work to ask more questions, challenge inequalities, and campaign for the adoption of good practice on the local level

4. That the current project will produce a resource toolkit to be hosted on the OUSU website, and a campaigning document which will set out OUSU’s priorities in this area, our minimum expected standards, and some examples of best practice.

5. That this is uncharted territory for OUSU – we’ve never supported students as workers and employees before.

6. The types of work graduates undertake vary considerably.

7. The attached Annex, a paper that was presented to the Joint Sub-Committee of Education Committee with Student Members on 31 May 2017.

**Council Believes:**

1. That opportunities to work are extremely valuable to students, as they provide the chance to gain experience, receive training, and build skills that are necessary for career progression.

2. That students deserve certain minimum standards in any work they undertake within the collegiate University.

3. That the increasing casualisation of the Higher Education sector adversely affects early career academics and graduate students, and also has equality implications.

4. That students should not be seen as cheap labour.

5. That work opportunities should be clearly and fairly advertised and allocated.

6. That relevant training should be part of the work undertaken (and in particular for those in student-facing roles, training in unconscious bias cultural awareness, and welfare).
7. That anyone who undertakes work for the collegiate University should receive clear guidance in advance of commencing, particularly around expected responsibilities, working conditions and hours, and pay (including logistics of payment).

8. That OUSU should be in close contact with the Universities & Colleges Union (UCU) about this stream of work.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the Vice-Presidents (Graduates) and (Charities & Community) to lobby the collegiate University to improve the working conditions of graduate students who work, particularly following the principles set out in Believes 1-8.

2. To adopt Believes 1-8 as OUSU policy.

Proposer: Marina Lambrakis, St John's/OUSU
Seconder: Beth Currie, Corpus Christi/OUSU

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: This motion codifies a lot of the work Beth and I have been doing last term and this term around graduates in the university and the work they do. Whether that’s a junior dean, an assistant in the libraries or those who teach. We don’t want it to be lost. We think it’s really important work and think it should be saved as a priority by the organization and that’s why we put it in a motion.

Harry Hatwell, St John’s: Do you have any data about when jobs are advertised in college and the pay ect? Because some of it is quite shocking.

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: This isn’t any data collection yet. Apart from speaking to colleges and grads. The university are a bit sensitive around numbers but it is an important part of what we’re doing. We’re looking to set up guidelines around similar types of jobs being treated the same.

Dane Rodgers, Merton College: Could you not get more data through a freedom of information request?

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: We could, the root we’re going down at the moment has been one more of collaboration. FOIs tend to come across quite negatively to the university. It would also take quite a lot of time. Also job descriptions do vary and that’s a big part of it but we don’t have enough time to do that before we leave.

PASSED WITHOUT OPPOSITION

4. Diversity of OUSU’s Trustee Board

Council Notes:
1. That according to Article 13.1, the OUSU Trustee Board is made up of:
   a. Up to six Sabbatical Trustees,
   b. Up to five Student Trustees, and
   c. Up to four External Trustees,
   1. elected in accordance with Articles 14 to 16.
2. That this year, one Sabbatical Trustee is a man, three out of the four External Trustees are men, and all four Student Trustees are men.
3. That this year, two out of fourteen Trustees are people of colour.
4. That OUSU has struggled to recruit women and people of colour to office for some time.
5. That OUSU’s six delegates to NUS Conference are elected in accordance with NUS guidelines, which state that 50% of the delegation must consist of self-defining women.

Council Believes:

1. That we are committed to equality and liberation, particularly (but not exclusively) in our representative and decision-making structures.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the President, Vice-President (Welfare & Equal Opportunities), and Vice-President (Women) to look into ways to make the Trustee Board more diverse, and in particular the possibility of gender-based quotas for non-Sabbatical Trustees similar to that in operation with our NUS delegates.
2. To mandate the President, Vice-President (Welfare & Equal Opportunities), and Vice-President (Women) to report back to Council on this issue in Michaelmas Term 2017.

Proposer: Marina Lambrakis, St John’s/OUUS

Seconder: Sam Banks, Merton

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: This is fairly straight forward, we have a few of our external trustees who will be coming up to election in the next year or so, our student trustees are elected yearly, basically we thought it was a good idea to do a piece of work on the diversity of the trustee board because it’s kind of undiverse. One of the things in particular we wanted to mandate was whether we should have a gender based quota for student trustee in particular.

PASSED WITHOUT OPPOSITION

5. Bop and Entz Themes (Amended Lapsing Policy)
Council Notes:

1. The following believes and resolves are amended versions of current OUSU policy
2. This motion is to amend and renew the lapsing policy

OUSU Believes

1. That welfare concerns should influence the choice of entz themes.
2. That the role of a bop is to bring a college together and for its members to enjoy themselves in a safe environment.
3. That entz with themes that have large scope for offence, or which intentionally cause offence, such as Bad Taste Bops, are a welfare issue because:
   a. The publicity and the event itself can be highly offensive or upsetting to students;
   b. Highly sexualised themes can have distressing impacts on marginalised communities
4. That Entz with highly gendered themes are a welfare issue because:
   a. There is usually an implicit or explicit gender divide, and for anyone who does not identify with traditional binary gender roles this may be problematic.
   b. Often such themes give a role usually seen as superior or more powerful to men, and a submissive, inferior role is given to women.
   c. Often such themes will stereotype men and women in a highly objectified and/or sexualised role (e.g. vicars and tarts, pimps and hoes, ‘fox hunts’).
   d. Entz events which mock or encourage the mocking of gender presentation (e.g. when cis men are encouraged to dress as women for the sole purpose of entertainment) can be upsetting to trans students and students who do not identify with traditional binary gender roles, but may have the potential also to be a friendly environment if dealt with sensitively.
5. That Bops or Entz with culturally appropriative themes (such as ‘Cowboys and Indians’, ‘Arabian Nights’) or that are otherwise racially or culturally insensitive can cause BME and international students to feel excluded, mocked or distressed in JCR and MCR spaces.
6. Cultural appropriation is defined as an act by which a member of a dominant culture uses the clothing, traditions, aesthetic customs or other cultural markers of a marginalised culture to their own benefit, ignoring the
history and context of these cultural markers and failing to give credit to their origins and proper use.

7. That cultural sharing and celebration is different from cultural appropriation, in that it contains no element of mockery or costume, and is carried out with the equal participation of BME, international, or other relevant group of students.

8. That the above problems might cause many people to be uncomfortable attending bops, which should be as inclusive as possible.

9. That many bop themes are possible and do exist that do not run into these problems.

10. That JCRs and MCRs can choose their own Bop and Entz themes.

**OUSU Resolves**

1. To regularly contact JCR/MCR/SU Welfare Officers, Equal Opportunities Officers, Women’s Officers, LGBTQ officers and Entz Officers raising the above concerns.

2. To encourage the reporting to common room or college welfare teams of bop themes which have been considered to be in bad taste or which have left any individual offended, upset or otherwise made to feel uncomfortable in attending.

3. To mandate the VP (Welfare and Equal Opportunities) to include in Freshers’ Week training information and advice on inclusive Entz themes.

4. To make all Believes and Resolves 1-3 OUSU Policy

**Proposer: Orla White, OUSU**

**Seconder: Sandy Downs, OUSU**

Orla White, VP Women: This is lapsing policy so it was passed a few years ago and I’m just bringing it back so Council can decide if we still need it. Essentially it talks about ensuring that the VP Welfare but also VP Women and any of the Sabbs are able to give advice on Bop Themes which aren’t going to make students feel they are excluded from their Common Room. So an example might be ‘Mexican’ as a theme which would be awful because ‘Mexican’ is not a costume. It’s quite hard to work this policy but the general idea is not to have themes which intentionally mock people or a group. This doesn’t mandate any Common Rooms but mandates OUSU to work with Common Rooms to create fun no offensive themes.

PASSED WITHOUT OPPOSITION

6. Advertising ban on LIFE (Amended Lapsing Policy)
Council Notes:
1. The following believes and resolves are amended versions of current OUSU policy
2. This policy lapses at the end of Trinity 2017
3. This motion is to amend and renew the lapsing policy

Council Believes:
1. That pregnant people deserve impartial and non-directional information and advice and the best person to make decisions around pregnancy is the pregnant person themselves.
2. That LIFE’s counselling and publicity is directive; specifically it intentionally directs people away from accessing abortion because of its own ideological stance on abortion.
3. That it is inconsistent and irresponsible for LIFE to claim to be “here to help you take the time to think about all of your options” whilst still being against abortion in all circumstances, stating “there can never be a good enough reason to intentionally take the life of an unborn child”.
4. That organisations that give misleading advice can be actively harmful.
5. That anti-choice messages can be triggering and harmful for people that have chosen to terminate or are considering terminating a pregnancy.

Council Resolves:
1. To instigate and maintain an advertising ban on LIFE and other organisations which provide directional abortion advice and to provide students with information about impartial, non-directional pregnancy and abortion advice providers.
2. To make all Believes and Resolves 1 OUSU Policy

Proposer: Orla White, OUSU
Seconder: Sandy Downs, OUSU

Orla White, VP Women: Here are some of the things which LIFE has said to people who have called them, none of which are particularly good. Basically is a pro-life advice service, since 2005 we have had a ban on advertising their service in our publications and at our events such as freshers’ fair. The reason for that is that LIFE claims to be non-directive however, when called by a male who was talking about his girlfriend contemplating abortion he was told “It’s your responsibility to change her mind it’s your baby too”. Another girl who was talking about wanting to get an abortion she was given incorrect information about what the abortion would be and was told that any abortion method was horrific. She was told to think about the rest of your life and to think about how it would affect he. The implication was that abortion would be a traumatic event that no one could recover from essentially. The
operator is extremely emotionally using language and was not impartial with the advice and support. We don’t think it’s appropriate for that kind of advice to be given. Someone trained as an advisor is taught never to be prescriptive in the advice you give in that situation.

Aaron Taylor, Blackfriars: Given that LIFE runs services like three hospices for terminally ill people, why should the ban apply to it as an organization and not simply to it’s activities with regards to abortion.

Orla White, VP Women: Personally, I’m sure they do wonderful work with the terminally ill, but for the large part they are not advertising their hospices in OUSU newsletters, they are not asking to advertise that at our fresher’s fair essentially what we have is LIFE asking us to advertise them in regards to their anti-abortion views.

Alex Curtis, Chair: Can we remind people that they should not be filming the speaker in Council. Anyone currently filming in Council please stop.

Alexandria Davis, St Edmund Hall: A quick question about the anti-choice messages, do you have any examples of anti-choice messages?

Oral White, VP Women: For example, LIFE does not believe that abortion is acceptable in the case of rape. I think it’s a stance which Council would not agree with.

Danielle Green, St John’s: I think the problem here is the claim can’t provide impartial and non-directive advice because they are anti-abortion as an organization. The British Association of Councillors and practitioners disagree with this. It doesn’t make sense to have a blanket advertising ban. This motion makes it very hard, for those whose personal stance is anti abortion, to find advice. Some people’s choices are being facilitated because OUSU allows abortion organisations to give out their information but doesn’t allow LIFE to give theirs. In summary nothing in the motion promotes actual choice because it takes one set of choices off the table.

???: If you are so inclined on receiving advice about pro life maybe you should look for an organization which doesn’t have so much controversy surrounding it. That hasn’t published an article in 2014 that’s called ‘after abortion’ that told people abortion gives people cancer, leads to mental health issues. You should look for an organization that’s based on actual fact rather than what seems to be dribble that been disproven by so many organizations and experts.

Ben Conroy, St John’s: It seems to me the issue is whether an organization which has a pro-life stance can give impartial advice.

Orla White, VP Women: I’m not just saying we shouldn’t advertise LIFE because it is pro-life. I’m saying we should not advertise LIFE because they told someone you should stop your girlfriend having an abortion. I’m saying we should continue to not advertise LIFE because they give out misinformation about what the abortion process is. They give medically incorrect information to a vulnerable person and we can’t countenance that. Whether pro-life or pro-choice people need non-directive informed opinions and advice. They need to be able to feel supported they don’t
need to be pushed in any one direction.

Adam Marshall, Worcester College: Just a procedural question, could we put an amendment on this motion so we ban all directional advice and not just LIFE? Because obviously there are multiple pro-life advocacy group do you not think it would be best to ban all directional advertising as well as LIFE?

Orla White, VP Women: yes in resolves 1. ‘other organisations which provide directional abortion advice and to provide students with information about impartial, non directional pregnancy and abortion advice providers.’

PROCEEDURAL MOTION TO MOVE TO VOTE

Eden Bailey, VP AccAff: I think most people know how they are going to vote on this so we should move to vote.

Joshua Clements, St John’s: There are some other people who would like to voice their opinions.

MOVE TO VOTE, VOTE

For: 35 (88%)
Against: 5 (13%)
Abstentions: 4

MOVE TO VOTE PASSES

VOTE ON THE MOTION

For: 37 (86%)
Against: 6 (14%)
Abstentions: 0

MOTION PASSED

10. Trigger Warning (Amended Lapsing Policy)

Council Notes:

1. The following believes and resolves are amended versions of current OUSU policy
2. This policy lapses at the end of Trinity 2017
3. This motion is to amend and renew the lapsing policy

OUSU Believes:

1. That Council should be as accessible as possible to students, especially those who have been personally affected by the topics Council discusses.
2. That triggering students unnecessarily can be damaging to their wellbeing.
3. That trigger warnings allow for, rather than prohibit, increased participation in debate.
Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the Chair of Council to issue trigger warnings for potentially upsetting topics at the beginning of Council, so as to give enough time for students to prepare themselves or to leave.
2. To mandate Steering Committee to issue trigger warnings on Council Agendas.
3. To highlight the multiple elected officers to whom the Chair or members of Steering Committee can direct questions if they are unsure whether or not a topic requires a trigger warning.
4. Make resolves 1-3 OUSU policy

Proposer: Orla White, OUSU
Seconder: Sandy Downs, OUSU

Orla White, VP Women: Trigger warnings are really useful the serve as advance warnings that a topic may be distressing. The idea isn’t to not let people discuss things, sometime they are misunderstood to be this, but rather it serves as a way to give time for people to decide whether they wish to take part in a discussion and if they do prepare themselves for it. It helps people get involved in discussions and helps them see what’s coming up. This mandates the chair of council to mention trigger warnings at the start of council and steering to mark the agenda with trigger warnings. There is no list of what a trigger warning is because we’d inevitably miss something but there are Sabbs and campaigns who can direct steering.

Sam Banks, Merton College: It doesn’t say about making policy in the resolves?

Orla White, VP Women: it should could we amend that.

AMENDMENT TO ADD RESOLVES 4 TO MAKE RESOLVES 1-3 OUSU POLICY IS FRIENDLY

Dane Rodgers, Merton College: Could it be counter productive giving someone a trigger warning because you’d have to say what the triggering thing is and that could trigger people?

Orla White, VP Women: This is about whether we call it a trigger warning or a content note. I think it makes sense to use a content note but we decided not to bring it as it makes things confusing to change them. If people want to amend then you can but there’s a kind of grey area about what a trigger warning is and what a content warning is.

Dane Rodgers, Merton College: I was mandated by my president to vote against this motion.
Alex Curtis, Chair: A mandate comes from a democratic process of a constituent organization. Being told to vote a certain way by a certain person is a proxy.

???: I’d just like to make the point that ordinary people would laugh at us doing this and we have to build some kind of emotional resilience.

Eden Bailey, Vp AccAff: ‘Normal people’ that’s really interesting because trigger warnings are used typically to help people with disabilities and mental health problems access content they might not otherwise be able to. Also it helps people from liberations who are oppressed in other ways. So by saying normal people you are saying people are abnormal for needing help accessing that content. Anyone who doesn’t identify as part of a liberation please remember trigger warnings are not designed to help you.

Catherine Kelly, St Hugh’s: on the note of emotional resilience there is no evidence that constantly being confronted with something which is shocking makes you tougher or stronger. Trigger warnings are just like a newscaster saying ‘this is going to be graphic’.

???: Can I make a friendly amendment to change trigger warning to content warning?

Michael Aglius, Hertford College: I’m going to attempt to repeat what has been said but before I came here I had a slight concern there was a chance that because of motions like this, because for those that they don’t affect there’s a worry that this can seem a little over the top. That’s not something I believe its something they believe and I think it would be good for this motion to do something to bring people on that aren’t persuaded by this stuff. Because it’s not very persuasive, although its all you can say its not very persuasive to say ‘this doesn’t affect you but it does affect us’. Would it be possible to put something in place to firm up what we mean by what does and doesn’t require a trigger warning?

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: We’d be amiss if we didn’t warn epileptic people of flashing lights and the same applies here with trigger warnings

Eden Bailey, VP AccAff: Content warnings and trigger warnings are slightly different and both are important. We should think about which is more important in regards for Council.

Orla White, VP Women: If we constantly try to sell this idea to those who don’t agree with trigger warnings then we probably aren’t going to get much done. There will come a point when people will just accept it and not notice it anymore.

Alex Curtis, Chair: We’re going to move to vote now.
VOTE ON TRIGGER WARNINGS

For: 34 (94%)
Against: 2 (6%)
Abstentions: 5

7. Motion to end the wearing of scholar’s gowns to exams

Council Notes:

1. Currently ‘commoners’ gowns are worn as standard for all exams.
2. Scholars and exhibitioners can wear ‘scholar’s gowns’ for all exams except for vivas.
3. People who do not have a scholar’s gown can feel stressed, uncomfortable and inferior to their peers.
4. Women, BAME and disabled people underperform in finals:
   a. As of 2014 men make up 54% of the undergraduate student body but receive 60% of the firsts, women make up 46% of the student body and receive 40% of the firsts.
      i. OUSU’s welfare survey showed ‘Women and non-binary undergraduates were over twice as likely as men to state that they felt anxious most or all of the time. The same was true for feeling overwhelmed and feeling stressed. Undergraduate men were almost twice (1.9 times) as likely as undergraduate women and non-binary students to report feeling confident most or all of the time.’
      ii. Women in STEM subjects are underrepresented and receive substantially fewer firsts than men.
   b. There is a race gap at finals, as of 2014 32% of white students get firsts but only 25% of Asian, 18% of black and 16% of Chinese students do;
      i. OUSU’s welfare survey showed ‘BAME undergraduates were 1.5 times more likely than non-BAME undergraduates to state that they felt overwhelmed most or all of the time.’
   c. There is a disability gap in finals. As of 2014 22% of students with disabilities achieved a first, compared to 31% of those without a disability;
      ii. OUSU’s welfare survey found ‘Disabled or chronically ill undergraduates were twice as likely as undergraduates without disabilities to state that they felt anxious most or all of the time. The same was true for feeling overwhelmed and feeling stressed’.
6. The gender attainment gap at Oxford is one of the worst in the country.

7. Oxford is the only university in the UK to have differentiated gowns in exams.

8. Upon achieving a first earlier in their degree, many students also receive scholarship money and special dinners.

9. In Trinity term 2016 a motion was successfully passed to make commoner’s gowns compulsory in viva exams, in order to reduce bias.

10. In Michaelmas term 2014 a referendum was held on the scrapping of compulsory sub fusc, with 75% of those voting in opposition to the motion and in support of sub fusc. During the referendum, one of the principal arguments put forward in favour of sub fusc was that it acts as a leveller and builds community spirit, and differentiated gowns were not the main point of debate.

11. Research on stereotype threat finds many instances in which social difference being emphasised in an exam context negatively impacts exam performance for the group designated as inferior, and this would plausibly apply to the visual difference between those in scholar’s gowns as compared to everyone else.
   http://diversity.arizona.edu/sites/diversity/files/stereotype_threat_overview.pdf

12. Scholar’s gowns are worn for multiple occasions, for example formal hall at the majority of colleges, and therefore would still be used outside of examinations.

13. Scholar’s gowns cost approximately £45 to students whose colleges do not purchase them on their behalf, and almost all students already own a commoner’s gown.

**Council Believes:**

1. Feelings of stress, discomfort and inferiority are detrimental to good exam performance and should be minimised.
   a. The greater feelings of being stressed and overwhelmed felt by students in minority groups may be one cause of the finals gap.

2. Performance earlier in one’s degree may reflect ease of assimilation into the Oxford environment and those with less privileged backgrounds may find it harder to perform well at first.

3. Prelims are not an adequate measure of potential.

4. That sub fusc should act as an equaliser in exam situations if it is to truly have a role in building community spirit.

5. As OUSU’s ‘Education Vision’ states, the purpose of a university education
is to provide an ‘opportunity for students to learn, grow and develop as thoughtful and compassionate global citizens.”
a. The hierarchical nature of the gowns system does not contribute to this, and in the case of exams may actively inhibit it.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the Vice President (Access & Academic Affairs), President, and any other relevant sabbatical officers to lobby the University to change the system of differential gown-wearing in examinations.
2. To make it OUSU policy to oppose the wearing of differential gowns in examinations.
3. To lobby the appropriate university bodies to implement this policy.

Proposer: Matilda Agace, Wadham College
Seconder: Isobel Cockburn, Wadham College

Matilda Agace, Wadham College: This motion proposes to scrap scholars gowns in examinations. The reason for this is because it can cause stress to be given a visual indication of another’s superiority as you walk into your exam. Research shows that being shown signs of inferiority can negatively impact on exam performance. In the 2014 referendum one argument was that subfusc created a level playing field for all students but scholars gowns negate that. We do think people should be proud of their achievements but not at the detriment of other students.

Jack Hampton, Pres: Straw poll of how many people already have mandates

Alex Curtis, Chair: It seems not many have mandates

???: ???

AMENDMENT CHANGE ALL STUDENT TO ALMOST ALL STUDENTS FRIENDLY

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grad: All I want to say is I know some JCRs will have consulted on this already but MCRs might not have had a chance to do so.

Ed Love, St John’s: I don’t have a mandate and don’t feel comfortable voting on this without one because then I’m not representing my common room. I’d like to share some feedback from my students; the achievement argument that student are just proud that they get to wear a scholar gown and aren’t making a statement by it. The empirical argument that you can’t attribute causation in this instant. The autonomy argument, that students have the right to choose to wear the gown...

Matilda Agace, Wadham: This motion isn’t meant to demonise people who choose to wear scholar’s gowns. It’s a hard decision to make because on the one hand you’re proud of your achievements but on the other you’re having a negative affect
on your peers.

Michael Agius, Hertford College: You mentioned studies how different biases can affect performance but what you have to remember about those studies they targeted ??????. I don’t think oxford has a policy of only accepting students they think can get a first at the end of the prelims. I don’t think we can use the studies as evidence of this. When you talk to people about what the study was about they turned out to do just as well. Would it not be the case that you can solve the issue by explaining that anxiousness exists?

Alex, StCatz: I will vote following my mandate. This is the type of issue students will be annoyed that they weren’t consulted on. Try and get the feeling from your common rooms before letting this pass.

Eden Bailey, VP AccAff: I sit on my commmittees in the uni realting to access and academic affairs. I know a lot about this topic, I can tell you that it is true what is stated in this motion. Your prelims are massively affected by whether you went to a public school or a state school or your upbringing before coming to Oxford.

Marina Lambrakis, VP Grads: If this motion does not get 2/3 it goes to all student consultation.

Dane Rodgers, Merton College: I think it’s problematic for the university to tell stuents what they can and cant wear.

PROCEEDURAL MOTON TO GO ALL STUDENT CONSULTATION

Josh O’Connor, DSO: An All Student Consultation is looks and feels like a referendum but is not mandating or binding. The motion and the results of the consultation will come back to the next Council so you can make a more informed decision on it.

Dane Rodgers, Merton College: We are having a discussion on something which greatly affects students not in the room so we should consult them

Lucas, Wadham College: I think we shouldn’t go to All Student Consultation because its 7th week and by the time the motion comes back to Council the proposers will have left. No one will be here to vote on the consultation. Also if the common rooms and ouusu reps had been doing their jobs the common rooms would have been consulted already. I understand that’s not the case with grad common rooms.

VOTE ON ALL STUDENT CONSULTATION

For: 21 (54%)
Against: 18 (45%)
Abstentions: 3
9. Make #pledgedecrim Policy

Council Notes:

1. That in 7th Week Council of Michaelmas Term 2015, a motion entitled 
   '#PledgeDecrim' was proposed by Lucy Delaney and Stephanie Kelley.
2. That the minutes show that this motion was passed.
3. That while the motion mandates certain actions, due to the wording of the 
   motion it did not become OUSU policy, and as such cannot be included in 
   official OUSU documentation such as policy books.
4. That this makes it more difficult for sabbatical officers to act as mandated 
   by the motion, and could lead to the motion being forgotten or 
   disregarded.

Council Believes:

1. That the ‘believes’ and ‘resolves’ [Appendix A] in the motion are valuable 
   and should become policy in order to ensure continuity and accountability.

Council Resolves:

1. To make the ‘believes’ and ‘resolves’ in [Appendix A] OUSU policy.

Proposer: Orla White, OUSU

Seconder: Sandy Downs, OUSU

Orla White, VP Women: Last year this was passed by council but was not made into 
policy so this is a motion to make it policy.

Dane Rodger, Merton College: two concerns, firstly should you be able to buy 
consent to use someone legally? Maybe we should go to consultation on that.

Orla White, VP Women: Please don’t talk about using sex workers. Sex workers 
should be the ones to have the say on whether their work is criminalized or not.

VOTE ON THE MOTION

For: 34 (100)

Against: 0 (0%)

Abstentions: 5

BELOW THE LINE

8. Condemning UKVI's Email Charge #FreeEmails

Council Notes:
1. Changes announced by UK Visas & Immigration on 30 May that relate to customer enquiries to UKVI, which will affect people applying for visas from outside the UK. From 1 June, customer enquiries will be handled by a new commercial partner (Sitel UK). The main changes to service are:
   a. Changes to phone numbers and opening hours
   b. Reducing the number of languages offered to 8 (including English)
   c. Customers who contact UKVI by email will be charged £5.48 per specific enquiry

2. Policy passed without opposition in 7th week Trinity Term 2016, which states:

   “OUSU believes international students play a crucial role in the student community, and should be supported during their time at the University. That the Government should remove unfair restrictions on international students, including overly restrictive and expensive visas, and unfair additional charges such as for NHS use. That the Government should make it easier for international students to remain in the UK after studying if they wish to work or continue their studies. That the University should work to ensure that international offer-holders and students are assisted as much as possible, especially with respect to visas.

   OUSU resolves to mandate OUSU officers, in particular the Vice-President (Graduates) to ensure the University continues to offer international students with the advice and assistance they need, both when applying and when on-course. To mandate OUSU officers to lobby the Government (including by working with other bodies) to remove excessive visa restrictions and charges for international students, and to make it easier for international students to stay in the UK to work or study after their course.”

3. The justification given for these changes: to “help the government reduce costs and ensure those who benefit directly from the UK immigration system make an appropriate contribution.”

4. That the current cost of a Tier 4 visa application for a single student is £335, and there is also an immigration health surcharge of £150 per year of your visa. These costs are higher for those with dependents.

5. That some Commonwealth and other externally administered scholarships cover visa costs, but many of the University’s own funding packages do not.
Council Believes:

1. That international students and staff are integral to the continued prosperity of the University of Oxford, and are valued members of our community.
2. That immigrants are vital to the UK economy, as they bring valuable skills and expertise, and contribute hugely to our society.
3. That the UK Higher Education sector and Oxford in particular should remain as outward-looking and welcoming as possible to people from all over the world, whether they come to the UK to study or work in our Higher Education institutions.
4. That in the current climate of Brexit and rising levels of xenophobia and racism around the world, it is imperative that international students are properly supported.
5. That the reasons given for these changes are disingenuous and that those who benefit directly from the UK immigration system already make a considerable and appropriate contribution, not only through the extortionate visa fees they pay but also in less tangible forms.
6. That any increases in visa application and related charges are more likely to adversely affect those from low-income backgrounds and from countries of lower socio-economic status.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the Vice-President (Graduates) to write a statement condemning this change to be published on the OUSU website, and to lobby the Government to reverse these changes, removing the £5.48 charge and increasing the number of languages available (including by writing to the Home Secretary to this effect).
2. To mandate the OUSU officers, and in particular the Vice-President (Graduates), to lobby the University to cover the costs associated with applying for a visa as part of the University’s funding and scholarship schemes, and in particular any funding that is means-tested.
3. To make Believes 1-6 OUSU policy.

Proposer: Marina Lambrakis, St John’s College/OUSU

Seconder: Julia Hamilton, Queen’s College
11. Living Wage (Amended Lapsing Policy)

Council Notes:

1. That OUSU has had policy on the Living Wage since Michaelmas Term 2005
2. That this policy was renewed in OUSU Council in Trinity Term 2014
3. That since Trinity 2011 the Oxford Living Wage Campaign has been an official OUSU campaign and since then the University and 11 colleges have become accredited Living Wage employers, and many more, though not accredited, endeavor to raise their wages in line with the increases in the real Living Wage.
4. That on 8th July 2015, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne announced what he called ‘the National Living Wage’ to come into effect from April 2016 for employees over the age of 25.
5. Currently, the ‘National Living Wage’ is currently set at £7.50, the minimum wage for 21-24 year olds is £7.05 and 18-20 year olds is £5.60.
6. Currently, the real Living Wage, as set by the Living Wage Foundation each November, is £8.45 across the UK and £9.75 in London, for anyone age 18 and over.

Council Believes:

1. That people should be paid enough to live decently, and the best way to ensure this is to support a Living Wage. That employees of the University and its Colleges should be paid the real Living Wage.

Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the OUSU Executive to assist, where possible, in terms of mobilising students, providing publicity and liaising with University and College officials who have the power to make changes and implement the Living Wage.
2. That the Oxford Living Wage Campaign shall be responsible for:
   a. Campaigning for a Living Wage for all staff in Colleges, Departments and the central administration of Oxford University
   b. Encouraging Colleges and Departments of Oxford University who currently pay a Living Wage to become accredited Living Wage employers
   c. Working with the wider community to achieve a city-wide Living Wage in Oxford.
3. To make OUSU Council believes 1 and OUSU Council resolves 1 and 2 OUSU Council Policy.
Proposer: Beth Currie, Corpus Christi College
Seconder: Sandy Downs, Corpus Christi College

12. Fairtrade Policy (Amended Lapsing Policy)

Council Notes:

1. OUSU Council last passed policy on Fairtrade in 2014, and so it will lapse at the end of the academic year unless it is renewed.
2. OUSU Council can pass policy and that this policy lapses after three years and must be brought as a new motion to Council in order to be renewed and remain OUSU policy.

Council Believes:

1. That OUSU should lead by example in buying ethically and encouraging others to do so.

Council Resolves:

1. To adopt the Fairtrade policy in the Appendix.

Proposer: Beth Currie, Corpus Christi College
Seconder: Sandy Downs, Corpus Christi College

h. Items for debate
i. Any other business