

Council Minutes

7th Week Michaelmas Term 2016

7th Week Council was at 5:30pm, Wednesday 23rd November 2016 at Maplethorpe Building, St Hugh's College.

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

- a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
 - b. Matters Arising from the Minutes
 - c. Elections in Council
 - d. Reports from and questions to the Sabbatical Officers, Executive Officers, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (*Raise and Give*), report from the Trustee Board, and report from the Trinity Term 2016 Returning Officer on the National Union of Students (NUS) affiliation referendum
 - e. Visit from Richard Brooks, NUS Vice President (Union Development)
 - f. Items for Debate
 1. National Union of Students democracy review
 - g. Items for Resolution
 1. Urging the Oxford University Press to withdraw its appeal in the Rameshwari Photocopy Services case before the Delhi High Court
 2. College opening hours
 3. OUSU involvement in the Teaching Excellence Framework
 4. Prevent landlords and letting agents from taking advantage of student tenants
 5. Accepting the Michaelmas Term 2016 Scrutiny Committee report
- Below the Line*
6. Consequential amendments to Campaign constitutions
 7. Updating guidance for Council's Scrutiny Committee
- h. Items for Debate
 - i. Any Other Business

* We mark some items as "below the line" if we think they are uncontroversial – these will not be discussed unless someone in Council requests this, and at least ¼ of voting members present agree.

Please Note:

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 Matt Tennant, Membership Services Manager (msm@ousu.ox.ac.uk) or Jo Gregory-Brough, Communications Manager (commsmanager@ousu.ox.ac.uk)

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

b. Matters Arising from the Minutes

c. Elections in Council

No Hust Requested for the position for Returning Officer.

Election Results:

35 For

2 Against

1 Spoilt Ballot

-
- c. **Reports from and questions to the Sabbatical Officers, Executive Officers, Representatives of the OUSU Campaigns and RAG (*Raise and Give*), report from the OUSU Trustee Board, and report from the Trinity Term 2016 Returning Officer on the NUS affiliation referendum (Appendix 1)**
-

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns)-Final calls for Graduate Div Reps, application close on Friday. Graduate Suspension of study focus group in going to take place week 9.

Sandy Downs (Corpus)-STI testing day was Corpus-over 70 people for HIV and Chlamydia. Preventing Prevent video is being planned filmed for Hilary 2017. Common Rooms Welfare Survey Reports will be done by the end of 8th Week MT.

Orla White (Brasenose)-More first respondent training run. Speaking to UAS about harassment policy. Starting a consultation for student sex workers.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen)-Eden explains they have been ill recently. Thanks to Jack and Eden for helping with various committee work and department reviews. Discussion via UG Panel and Senior Tutors committee on policy on workload and Colleges have some sort of suspension policy.

Beth Currie (Corpus)- Committee Christmas scheme-international students are matched up with local families. End of term clear outs are also taking place. Election pack is going online on Monday 28th December 2016.

Jack Hampton (St Catz) -Covered a education committees on behalf of Eden. Become a bone marrow donor. Jack is starting to a video blog. We also 95 students on a National Demo in London on the 19th November.

Reports from the Campaigns/RAG/Exec

Ben Peacock-Target Schools- (St Hughs College). Ben gives an update on recent elections from the committee

Trustee Board Update-Jack Hampton (St Catz) gives an update on the trustee board meeting. The meeting was 50% strategy away morning and then the other section of the board meeting itself. The strategy morning covered OUSU's new strategic plan work, including how to best use our student trustee's.

NUS Referendum Trinity 16 Report. Anna Moubry (New College) gives an update from the Trinity referendum. Main issues come from NUS staff members and problems in interpreting the rules of the referendum.

e. Visit from Richard Brooks, National Union of Students Vice President (Union Development)

Majority vote approve Richard Brooks attendance.

Richard is VP-Union Development from NUS. Richard gives an over-view of what NUS.

- 1.) Voice, lobbying, influence. Meeting MP's/lobby groups. Richard gives a few examples of some of the lobbying work that NUS has done-most recently Brexit/TEF/Higher Education Bill/Recent Budget.
- 2.) Union Develop. Training and development, legal advice, sabb training, supporting SU Staff.
- 3.) Enterprise. Saving students money. NUS Extra. Union Cloud. Bulk buy products.

Richard Brooks own projects:

Democracy Review-National Conference 2015 passed a motion to do a democracy review. Now in the process of working out what is right about democracy after everyone has said what is wrong. Consultation is now taking place with Student Unions. Consultation closes Friday 25th November.

Further College-Helping to develop student unions in FE Colleges-many do not have SU's in their colleges due to funding, a space etc.

Impact of Student Opportunities-Sports/Societies/RAG/fundraising. Helping to support these group find funding and registering their impact.

No questions to Richard.

f. Items for Debate

1. National Union of Students democracy review (**Proposed:** Jack Hampton, St Catherine's)

Two questions posed by National Union of Students, to be debated.

Q29. How else might NUS reach out to engage more students through students' unions and help them feel involved in decisions?

Lucas (Wadham) Question-Should NUS be doing more to address students directly as opposed to via Student Union's.

Jack Hampton (St Catz) NUS is made up of constituent bodies-like OUSU and they often deal directly with SU's. However, valid point of the debate.

Anna Moubry (New College)-NUS could improve its relations with local SU's by following the rules of local elections.

Sam Banks (Merton-Students) Often it feel like students don't have the full picture or facts around the information of decisions or have the time to read all the documents around discussion/arguments that are going on.

Richard Brooks (NUS) We are currently doing a communication review. NUS is made up of 600+ SU's. Often, the good news makes it down to the sabbatical team-however the bad news is what trickles down to students (via the media).

Zoe (Mansfield)-Like the structures of OUSU/NUS. Question around how students and individuals can get involved in the debate and contribute to the discussion if their views aren't considered to be part of the 'normal'.

Richard Brooks (NUS) Richard came to NUS from a sporting background in SU's rather than an activism background. This review is looking at the way we debate each other. Motions are structures in the way that it either passes or fails. Social media also plays a big part in debate, people in real life don't behave in the same way as opposed to in real life. NUS National Exec is a very diverse political body and we often don't articulate this.

Jack Hampton (St Catz) OUSU are also trying to help communicate what is going on at a national body to students at Oxford.

Beth Curry-(Corpus) What is NUS doing to address issues that have come out of the many NUS Referenda's that happened between April-June 2016.

Richard Brooks (NUS) After the conference in Brighton this year, 15 SU's held referendum's on NUS affiliation. 4 main reasons. 1.) People feeling NUS wasn't very democratic or represented their politics. 2.) Value for Money. Student Union's didn't understand where their money went. A new model of affiliation fee's is coming to conference this year. 3.) Anti-Semitism. Institutional racism review is happening. Robbie Young is VP Society & Citizenship is releasing a report based on experiences of Jewish students in SU movements. 4.) Relevance. Does NUS have a relevance in students' lives. Communication is a big part of this. NUS is having a new Heads of Comms and new Campaign function.

Will Jarrett- (Exeter) Is there the chance to throw into the direct election of President into the review exercise. One main reason of referendum happening at Oxford was students feeling couldn't change or influence NUS. One-Member-One-Vote failed at NUS Conference.

Richard Brooks (NUS) It can be if enough people speak about it. One-Student-One-Vote. National Conference was the body that voted it down. 2/3 national conferences debated it and voted it down. Many concerns came from smaller SU's and colleges around the practicalities of such a system. However, the consultation will consider it if enough people mention it.

Q7. How else might NUS increase accountability?

Sam Banks (Merton)-What are the mechanisms that students can hold NUS to account?

Richard Brooks (NUS) Three main ways. NEC which meets 5 times a year and made of a variety of student reps from across the movements. At National Conference you can submit a vote of no confidence or censure motions. You can also call an emergency conference. You can also ask questions to the national officers at the various NUS Zones (Higher Education, Further Education, Union Development, Society and Citizenship, Welfare). All of these systems above are quite old fashioned, not very accessible or via your SU.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen)-Quite difficult to submit questions during NUS Zones due to time restraints because the session was quite brief. There should be way students can submit questions over a longer period of time and allows to be done across the membership. Isn't a very clear and transparent way-only really accessible to those who currently understand the system.

Sam Banks (Merton)-Is there a more direct way-potentially using digital or online method. Potentially look to create a petitions style model.

Jack Hampton (St Catz)-We will take these comments from the minutes and enter to the response.

g. Items for Resolution

1. Urging the Oxford University Press to withdraw its appeal in the Rameshwari Photocopy Services case before the Delhi High Court

Council Notes:

1. The Delhi High Court in the case of *the Chancellor, Masters and the Scholars of the University of Oxford, trading as Oxford University Press v. Rameshwari Photocopy Service*, permitted the photocopying of certain course materials.
2. That the Oxford University Press has filed an appeal against this judgment before a larger bench of the Delhi High Court, scheduled to be heard on 29 November 2016.
3. That the authors and academics published by the Oxford University Press have recognized the social consequences of this decision and have opposed the filing of the original lawsuit.
4. That the case found that, contrary to the publisher's stance, Oxford University Press have not and will not suffer any significant losses by allowing students to photocopy excerpts of academic works for course packs.

Council Believes:

1. That the court's verdict protected the right of the students in India to have an affordable and meaningful education.
2. That the decision of the Oxford University Press to appeal the decision ignores the tremendous resource constraints with which students and institutions in developing countries are faced, and the many economic hurdles they have to overcome to access knowledge goods.
3. That if the Oxford University Press is successful in its appeal, it will result in an increase in the cost of higher education in India to the extent that higher education in India will be inaccessible to all but a privileged few
4. That it is disappointing for a University Press, affiliated to a University which strongly believes in devising ways for securing equitable access to knowledge, and instituting open access regimes with greater reach, to pursue such an aggressive litigation in a developing country.
5. It is important to support better access to education for students across the world, in line with existing OUSU policy.

Council Resolves:

- 1) To condemn this decision of the Oxford University Press to appeal the decision of the Delhi High Court.
- 2) To urge the Oxford University Press to withdraw their appeal before the Delhi High Court.
- 3) To mandate the OUSU Sabbatical officers to take all possible efforts to convince the Oxford University Press to withdraw their appeal before the Delhi Court.
- 4) To support the open letter to the Delegacy of the Oxford University Press by the students, urging them to withdraw their appeal.
- 5) To encourage all members associated with Oxford presently or in the past, to sign the above-mentioned open letter.
- 6) To continue OUSU's commitment to supporting better access to education for students.

Proposed: Gopika Murthy Lekshmi (Exeter)

Seconded: Arushi Garg (Magdalen)

No proposition Speech as proposer wasn't there.

Request for debate.

Jack Hampton-(St Catz). Within the University Structure, OUSU Sabbaticals have a mechanism to question the various trading arms of Oxford University. This is the sort of stuff that the University would like us to challenge/scrutinise.

Sam Banks (Merton)-How important is this to the sabbaticals considering all the other projects that is going on?

Jack Hampton (St Catz)-Happy to take forward if OUSU Council requests it.

For: 29

Against: 3

Abstentions: 20

MOTION PASSES.

2. College Opening Hours

Council Notes:

1. A considerable amount of colleges have opening hours.
2. These opening hours in some cases are fairly restrictive.

Council Believes:

1. These opening hours seem not to promote a community spirit within the University.
2. These opening hours are frustrating when visiting friends.
3. These opening hours are disliked by many students.
4. These opening hours relegate members of the university to view or enter colleges at peak times when tourists are allowed, which does nothing but increase congestion and/or inconvenience the student from a different college.
5. It is not a considerable number of students who would be visiting any one college at any one time, so the opening hours benefit colleges so negligibly and hinder students of the university markedly, that they should be repealed.

Council Resolves:

1. To condemn these opening hours as not in-keeping with the inter-collegiate community spirit.
2. To oppose that these opening hours for other students actually benefit the college in any real way.
3. To propose that members of the university, on presentation of a valid Bod card, should be admitted to a college (at very least before college doors shut for the night).
4. To mandate the President of the Student Union to lobby the policymakers of the various Oxford colleges with strict opening hours to implement the above resolution.

Proposed: Stephanos Iossifidis (St Peter's)

Seconded: Alex Zelenka-Martin (St Peter's)

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) Didn't understand what the motion was asking us to do. We were hoping to hear from the proposers who can explain what is it they want.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) Can we steer until the next meeting?

Taisie (Wadham) The motion doesn't really work as the resolves don't really make sense. We should vote against this instead of tabling it until the next meeting. Opposing opening hours doesn't really make sense. Is it unclear to people they have to turn up.

Matt Dawe (St Hugh's) Proposer was emailed.

Procedural Motion to Table Motion 2 to HT1 Week.

Vote-37

Against-6

Abstention-6

Motion tabled to HT1 Week.

3. OUSU involvement in the Teaching Excellence Framework

Council Notes:

1. Its policy "to support free education as a policy" (passed Michaelmas Term 2014), and "to condemn the increased marketization of this University, and Higher Education in Britain" (passed Hilary Term 2014).
2. The government's Higher Education & Research Bill, and particularly that it paves the way for a Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), based on which universities would be assessed on teaching quality and the results of which will be used to enable the raising of fees.
3. Its policy "to oppose and condemn the linking of fees to the assessment of teaching quality ... [and] the introduction of differentiated fees across the Higher Education sector" (passed in 3rd week, Michaelmas Term 2016).
4. That in 7th week Trinity term 2016, Council resolved to "organize a boycott/sabotage of NSS¹ and DLHE²", in part because (Council Believes 3): "sabotaging NSS and DLHE will disrupt the introduction of TEF, giving us leverage".
5. The motion passed in 7th week Trinity term mandating the Sabbatical Officers to lobby for the University of Oxford not to opt in to the Teaching Excellence Framework from Year 2.
6. The Sabbatical Officers' concerted efforts against TEF throughout Hilary, Trinity, and Michaelmas terms 2016.
7. That the TEF process consists of 2 parts:
 - a. an initial assessment of a university based on a range of metrics (NSS, DLHE, and student retention rates);
 - b. a 15-page submission prepared by the University with additional supporting evidence to explain performance on the metrics and supplement it.
8. That OUSU does much work on the quality of teaching at the University of Oxford, including by running the annual OUSU Teaching Awards, coordinating and training the course and

¹ National Student Survey

² Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey

Divisional Board reps and academic reps in Common Rooms, collecting considerable amounts of data (both quantitative and qualitative) on the student experience, and collating information on our various activities.

Council Believes:

1. That OUSU's strong and productive working relationship with the University is based on collaboration and mutual sharing of information, and that this allows us to be more effective when pushing for change.
2. That if the University were to prepare a submission for the TEF, they would likely wish to use additional evidence based on data held by OUSU.
3. That because of existing Council policy and resolutions detailed in Notes 1, 3, 4, and 5, the Sabbatical Officers require a steer from Council on whether, as a matter of principle, we should contribute OUSU-held data to any future TEF submission, should we be asked for it.

Council Resolves:

1. To discuss the matters detailed above (particularly Believes 2 and 3) for at least 10 minutes and as long as the Chair deems necessary to reach a resolution.
2. To mandate the Sabbatical Officers to be guided by the resolution reached by Council during the discussion.

Proposed: Marina Lambrakis (St John's)

Seconded: Beth Currie (Corpus Christi)

Marina Lambrakis (St John's). Marina gives an update on the TEF in regards to the University Opt In/Opt Out. All the TEF Policy we have is currently included in the motion. We aren't opposed to a supporting great teaching, just not when it is linked to tuition fees. Marina explains the metrics that are used. Firstly assessment of 6 metrics using nationwide data like Retention rates/NSS/DELI etc. Secondly, University submission which is a 15 page document that can contain data of their own. ML mentions issues around the sensitivity in sharing data that OUSU currently holds. For examples, we hold a lot of data from the OUSU Teaching Awards. OUSU needs to know what to do if they ask for it. The motion is asking you to debate that point and give OUSU a steer of what to do. This is a sensitive issue as it puts OUSU in a difficult position.

Taisie (Wadham)-Would it be a complete withdrawal of data/information that would improve the student experience?

Marina Lambrakis (St John's)-Just for TEF Submission.

Taisie (Wadham)-We should support motion if this is directly towards the TEF and hopefully the University will understand this.

Lucas (Wadham)-Are OUSU boycotting/sabotaging the NSS?

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns)-Yes.

Dan Mead (New College)-What are the sabbaticals thoughts on this?

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns)-Really not sure about the best way forward. We work closely with the University and it's a difficult position. Because of the seriousness of the situation, it's for OUSU Council to decide.

Jack Hampton (St Catz)-Quite important that we don't give a steer on this. It helps our argument either way if OUSU Council steers OUSU one way or the other.

Sam Banks (Merton)-Why would the University be unhappy if we didn't share the data.

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns)-It won't make their submission stronger.

Jack Hampton (St Catz)-The University might not have all the data on the student experience. OUSU might have useful data that would contribute to the TEF submission.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen)-We run a teaching award every year and that evidence could be used in strengthening their submission.

Anya (St Hilda's) We shouldn't in principle give the data. However TEF is going ahead and they might not get a high score. Is it possible they are not going to do into TEF.

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns) It isn't a 100% guarantee but they are going to TEF Opt in.

Bradley (St Edmund Hall)-Would they use any negative material we could give them?

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns) No-the University writes the report and would only use positive data.

Kelly (St Johns)- If we give them the data, it will help their submission. Is there a risk we could damage relations.

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns)-There is a downside that it could damage relationship.

Alex (St Catz)-Is this only if we go into TEF?

Marina Lambrakis (St John's)-We would tell them that we have voted not to give them any data. Higher scores would mean we can charge higher fees.

Bradly (St Edmund Hall)-OUSU not giving them information isn't going to hurt the application. Doesn't it make more sense to keep positive relationship with the University.

Lucas (Wadham)-Assume it's NUS Policy to boycott NSS and we should stand in solidarity with other SU's.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's)-Matter of principle-we oppose TEF and boycotting the NSS/not making it easy.

Rich (Keble)-How important is the good will of the University in getting work done?

Marina Lambrakis (St John's)-It's important. They do help facilitate us work/vice-versa.

Orla White (Brasenose) However, we are always willing to take the key issues to the University even if they are unpopular.

Rich (Keble)-Would withholding data be enough to change the University position on TEF.

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns)-They know that OUSU are opposed it. It would show *how* against it we are.

Straw Poll:

Give Information-0

Do not give information-40

Abstentions-6

For-48

Against-0

Abstain-0

MOTION PASSES

4. Prevent landlords and letting agents from taking advantage of student tenants

Council Notes:

1. A significant number of Oxford undergraduate and postgraduate students live in rental accommodation.
2. The Student Advice Service provides information and talks on living out, but more could be done to improve the rental situation in Oxford.
3. Oxford students living in University-run accommodation are protected by the Student Accommodation Code, but no similar protection exists for students in private rental accommodation.
4. Many student unions, such as the University of Warwick Student Union and UCLU, maintain lists of approved letting agents and landlords, who are required to meet certain codes of practice.
5. UCL carried out a successful rent strike in 2016, demonstrating that student action can produce substantial improvements to the situation of student renters.

Council Believes:

1. The welfare of students who rent is significantly affected by the quality of their accommodation and the conduct of their landlords and letting agents.
2. Students' short term leases and lack of experience renting property makes it easy for letting agents to take advantage of them.
3. The current renting climate in Oxford has led students to accept substandard and, in some cases, illegal living conditions.

Council Resolves:

That the relevant sabbatical officers be mandated to:

1. Collect information from Oxford undergraduate and postgraduate students on abuses they have experienced at the hands of letting agents and landlords in Oxford,
2. Use this data to create and maintain a blacklist of letting agents and landlords who have caused undue financial or emotional damage to student tenants, have included illegal terms in their rental agreements, or have failed to carry out their legal obligations to student tenants, and

- a. Advise students not to enter into contracts with letting agents or landlords on the blacklist,
 - b. Prevent letting agents or landlords on the blacklist from advertising in OUSU publications, in student newspapers, at the Freshers' Fair, or on <http://www.oxfordstudentpad.co.uk/> (the Oxford Accommodation Service's property finder), and
 - c. Challenge industry accreditations (e.g. membership of the Association of Residential Letting Agents or the National Association of Estate Agents) held by letting agents or landlords on the blacklist,
3. Include information on the Student Advice Service website and in the Living Out Guide on how to challenge actions and decisions of letting agents and landlords,
 4. Create an OUSU code of practice for letting agents and landlords on the model of those maintained by UCLU, WUSU and other student unions and present a draft of this to OUSU council in Hilary Term,
 5. Work with the Student Advice Service, Oxford Tenants' Union, the Oxford City Council, and other relevant groups to achieve these goals.

Proposed: Chris de Lisle (New College)

Seconded: Jack Doyle (St Hilda's College)

Chris de Lisle (New College)-A lot of Oxford Students are renting and can be quite vulnerable to bad letting agents. We should be trying to influence and change things for the better for students. Three goals of the motions. Firstly is about capturing data from the student body about their experiences, secondly about setting standards. We should be saying what we happy as standard and what isn't. Thirdly, is a initiative/development to help students challenge students when it goes wrong.

Amendment Proposed by Beth Currie and Sandy Downs which is accepted as friendly.

- **To add to resolves 1: Via the website 'Move-In'.**
- **To Delete resolves 2+3**
- **To add to resolves 4:**
 - **Mandate the Vice-President (Charities and Community) to create a OUSU Code of Practice.**
 - **Create a landlord and letting agents recommendation system and promote the Student Advice Service as a resource for the action of letting agents and landlords.**
 - **Add to resolves 5 'and Oxford Brooks Student Union'.**

Taisie (Wadham)-Is there any communication with letting agency to 'get there side of the story' or action to improve or would they just know their place on the ranking.

Chris de Lisle (New College)-Model used by Warwick SU. This is a set of standard that we would set ourselves for examples, fee's, quality of the building etc. and then the letting agents to meet as part of the work.

Alex (Somerville)-What would the effectiveness of the motion?

Chris de Lisle (New College)-Though we have limited power-however Warwick/UCL have been quite effective in changing the way landlords treat their students.

Amendment Proposed by Marina Lambrakis and Beth Currie which is accepted as friendly.

To add Resolves 6:

- **To refuse to advertise letting agents or landlord who are not recommended through the OUSU code of practice in any OUSU Communication.**

Beth Currie (Corpus)-OUSU/Brooks did try an accreditation scheme in 2012 and it didn't really work. Accreditation scheme is tricky because the demand outweighs the supply and consumer power doesn't really work. However, the students reviews on a property-by-property basis could be a more powerful tool.

Taisie (Wadham)--At Wadham, feedback on individual houses which was made into a google map. Students aren't the only renters in Oxford-student pressures do put pressure on the Oxford housing market. What potential impact could we have to help this? Could Oxford residents have any access to this material.

Beth Currie (Corpus)-The rating renting website would be available to the public.

Vote-44

Against-0

Abstain-0

Motion Passes

5. Accepting the Michaelmas Term 2016 Scrutiny Committee report:

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 Scrutiny Committee is required to present a report to council every term.
3. That, due to the current situation regarding Part time executives, it would not be productive to require that Part time executives are included in this term's report.
4. That a constructive and productive scrutiny report this term is one that focuses on the work of the current Sabbatical officers.
5. That this term's Scrutiny report is an accurate representation of the work of the Sabbatical officers.

Council Believes:

1. That the Scrutiny Report in Appendix 2 should be accepted by OUSU Council.

Council Resolves:

1. To accept the Scrutiny Report in Appendix 2 (available on the OUSU website).

Proposed: Joe Small (Jesus)

Seconded: Dan Mead (St John's)

Joe Small (Jesus College) Been chair of scrutiny committee for the last term. One issue that didn't make it into the report was the handling of issues from the previous sabbaticals to the new team. Something OUSU should look at.

Dan Mead (St John's) Please read it. It isn't that long.

Jack Hampton (St Catz) Please ensure that you read the report as it's important for democracy and make sure officers are held to account.

For-40

Against-0

Absentions-0

Below the line

6. Consequential amendments to Campaign constitutions

Council Notes:

1. Recent changes to OUSU's governing documents approved by Council (Trinity Term 2016), and in particular, minor amendments to the provisions concerning OUSU's campaigns and requirements for their constitutions.
2. That a series of consequential changes are needed to the constitutions of all of OUSU's Campaigns; Council approved some of these in Trinity Term 2016.
3. That Campaigns have been consulted on these changes, and that the amendments now only require Council's ratifications.

Council Resolves:

1. To ratify the amendments to SusCam's constitution, as provided in track-changes format in Appendix 3 (separate document on Council website).

Proposed: Sandy Downs (Corpus)

Seconded: Kate Cole (Regent's)

Mind Your Head Constitution Withdrawn.

No request for Debate. Motion passes.

7. Updating guidance for Council's Scrutiny Committee

Council Notes:

1. That Council's Scrutiny Committee has not been updated in line with the recent changes to the OUSU Bye-laws and governing documents which restructured OUSU.
2. That Council agreed in 5th week to shrink the size of the committee to 2, and provided guidance for Scrutiny Committee's activities.
3. That amendments to OUSU's Bye-Laws require a second reading at a later Council.

Council Believes:

1. Scrutiny of our officers not only lets our students evaluate how well their elected representatives are doing in their jobs, but also allows our elected officers to better think about how to grow in the role.
2. That if used correctly scrutiny of our officers will increase the profile of their work by examining it from an uninvolved perspective.

Council Resolves:

1. To give a Final Reading to amend OUSU's Bye-Laws as follows to reflect the changes to Scrutiny Committee (track changes version in Appendix 4 below):
 - a. In Bye-Law 9.6, replace "four" with "two".
 - b. In Bye-Law 10.2, replace "The chair of the Scrutiny Committee" with "The Scrutiny Committee", and "the chair" with "it".
 - c. In Bye-Law 10.3, delete "the chair of".
2. That the Bye-Law amendments in Resolves 1 will (subject to approval by OUSU's Trustee Board) take effect at the end of 8th week, Michaelmas Term 2016.

Proposed: Dan Mead (St John's)

Seconded: Joe Small (Jesus)

No request for Debate. Motion passes.

h. Any Other Business

A.O.B

Marina Lambrakis-(St Johns) NUS Passed Policy to Boycott the National Student Survey. OUSU then passed the motion to Boycott the National Student Survey. National ballot is like a referendum. OUSU Council needs to make the decision under NUS Guidelines.

National Ballot wording 'Should NUS complete a Risk and Equality assessment being conducted before the NSS Boycott campaign starts.'

The motion was proposed by a small group of SU's who thought Boycotting potentially may harm smaller SU's around the Country.

ML explains that the national ballot won't affect our policy, however it will affect the national campaign.

ML explains that we have two options: 1) Can have an extra-ordinary council. If we don't call an official council in 8th week to debate the motion. 2.) If we don't have an extra-ordinary council, we won't record the vote. No option to abstain. ML explains extra-ordinary council has struggled to get quoracy in past.

Matt Dawe (St Hugh's) We missed the emergency motion deadline, so apologies our end.

Orla White (Brasenose)-Getting quorum is really important, so please consider this when you vote.

Tom (St Anne's)-When would it be?

Marina Lambrakis-We'll let you know ASAP

? **(Merton)** What is quoracy?

Matt Dawe (St Hugh's) 35 People including sabs.

Taisie (Wadham)-Would a council not be that useful as colleges won't have meetings before then.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's)-National Ballot has to happen in the 8th December. There isn't any other alternative that is democratic. We can't make an official decision unless a council happens. It won't affect our campaign-however if it is risk assessed it could hold up the national campaign which may have knock on affects.

Branden Casey-(St Edmund Hall). It may probably pass-so it doesn't matter if we have another meeting.

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns) It's hard to tell.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) It's unusual for a risk assessment to be done on a Boycott which is supposed to be done on an activity.

Anya (St Hilda's) Are we voting to have an extra-ordinary Council, and if we don't do we vote now?

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns) If you vote to have an extra council, we will have that chance to debate and vote there and then. If you vote not to have one, we will not record a vote in the ballot.

Matt Dawe (St Hugh's)-Extra-Ordinary council would only be for the 1 item of discussion.

Dan (Queens)-Is the risk assessment an attempt to sabotage the boycott. We have a policy against the NSS and boycott and we should carry on our support by recording a vote.

Marina Lambrakis (St Johns)-Yes/No. There is a lot of debate.

Orla White (Brasenose)-We have to pass the motion through our democratic system.

For-30

Against-5

Abstentions-5

Extra-Ordinary Council will run in 8th Week MT 2016.

Jack Hampton (St Catz)-Please run for Chair of Council.