

Council Minutes

7th Week Trinity Term 2016

7th Week Council took place at 5:30pm on Wednesday 8th June 2016, at **St Catherine's** College, Bernard Sunley Lecture Theatre.

We aim to make council as accessible as possible, and ensure that it is always in accessible venues. However, if there are any accessibility requirements that we are not meeting for yourself or others, please contact OUSU's Democratic Support Officer on 01865 611831, or at dso@ousu.ox.ac.uk.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, please feel free to contact the Chair, Matt Collyer, 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*)
- e. Items for Resolution
 1. Abortion Rights Re-Affiliation
 2. Scrutiny Report
 3. Supporting the relaunch of Oxide Radio
 4. Global Justice Campaign
 5. Graduate Vision
 6. Welfare Vision
 7. Access Vision
 8. White Paper Response
 9. Action Against Fee Increases
 10. OUSU's Policies on International Students and Visas
- Below the Line
 11. Associate Membership
 12. Consequential Amendments to Campaign Constitutions
- f. Items for Debate
 1. OUSU Council Voting Reform
- g. Any Other Business

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Becky Howe (Pembroke) – Explained that the minutes were not yet available from the previous meeting, as a result of the NUS Referendum taking up so much of staff time.

b. Matters Arising from the Minutes

N/A

c. Elections in Council

Chair of Council - Matthew Collyer (New) and Matthew Dawe (St Hugh's) nominated

Matthew Collyer (New) – Stated that the chair of council has to be three things: competent, fair and non-political. Noted that he has had a number of different roles in his time at OUSU, all of which have been on the independent admin side of things, including Returning Officer in Michaelmas, Steering Committee and current Chair. Explained that in the elections he was crucially able to be impartial, and also had a necessary knowledge of the rules. Added that he chaired the referendum debate in a fair and impartial manner, explained the rules changes, and responded to questions and issues quickly during his time as chair. Promised to create a new guide to council next term, which incorporates all the new rule changes, and is included on the back of agendas, and to send out a summary after each meeting of what happened. Reiterated that he is non-political, does not have an agenda, and does not belong to any political societies.

Matthew Dawe (St Hugh's) – Echoed what Matthew said in terms of what the chair of council should be. Informed council that he had been the independent chair of Hugh's JCR for six terms now since he arrived in first year, and also chaired the NUS debates in the JCR. Stated that being impartial in that, and being able to chair between diverse views of student members made him want to run for this role. Noted that he does not have OUSU specific chair experience, but does have a big experience of chairing meetings. Stated that he would want to make everyone feel that they can come to OUSU council and have their voice heard, and that no-one, regardless of who they are, will not be heard. Urged that encouraging and engaging the audience to come forward and speak is the key to chairing. Added that he wants to encourage more people to come to council, and will work to get the information about council out there.

Taisie (Wadham) – Stated that once she was in council, and a trans student sent a tweet referring to another student as a trans-exclusionary radical feminist (TERF), and the chair said that unless the comment was withdrawn, she would be removed from council. Asked where the candidates would come down on that.

Matthew Dawe – Replied that all OUSU debate should have restrictions on free speech in terms of hate speech, so in terms of objections, if it is something addressing an individual, it is very much up to the individual being attacked to raise a complaint, and if they don't feel comfortable doing so, we need a mechanism for them to get to the chair to do so. Added that certain words, and certain marginalised terms, although that it not necessarily one, are unacceptable. Stated that for that example, he would give discretion to the person being attacked.

Matthew Collyer – Noted that a principle of this organisation is that it sets its own rules, and has the power to expel people if they are damaging democratic debate, and it is the responsibility of the chair to bring it to the attention of council. Argued for a fair, honest council, where people are courteous to each other. Stated that if someone was offensive, or was attacking another person, then council should have the opportunity to vote them out.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Asked for clarification, questioning if this was hate speech, or hate speech being called out. Asked if it more important to protect someone from a marginalised group calling someone out, or the person being called out.

Matthew Collyer – Answered that the chair needs to ensure that there is nothing being done to exclude marginalised groups, and the interest of those involved always needs to be considered. Added that he will ensure that decisions are balanced.

Matthew Dawe – Replied that everyone should feel that they can speak and be able to speak. Explained that he would always question the person who was using hate speech, and that this is the key issue to address. Added that the person it was directed at needs to be considered and we need to find out if their ability to speak and contribute has been affected.

Matthew Dawe (St Hugh's) was elected.

Returning Officer – Fraser Boistelle (New) and Joe Smith (Somerville) nominated.

Fraser Boistelle (New) – Informed council that he has been Deputy Returning Officer over the last term, and has supported the Returning Officer to run the NUS Referendum, including the drafting of statements. Noted that he would like the opportunity to run the statutory elections next term, and has no agenda and no knowledge at all of who is running.

Anna Mowbray (New) – Explained that Joe Smith was unable to attend and read out the following statement from him:

Hi Council! I'm Joe, a third year Germanist and therefore on my year abroad. However, I'll be back next year and keen to get involved in OUSU. I've been in OUSU before, having attended numerous councils and sat through hours of hustings and other OUSU commitments during two terms as Returning Officer.

I don't hold strong political views but am still rather dued up on the issues and could act well as an impartial figure. Additionally, I am a friendly and approachable person and could welcome new freshers to OUSU Council and its elections. Therefore, I am also someone who could liaise with candidates to ensure their concerns are addressed.

Moreover, I have a proven track record of competence, having overseen last Trinity's referenda, achieving probably the highest turnout of any election in the Student Union (41%, almost three times last year's annual elections). Having also run various elections in council, a by-election for Vice President (Graduates), a charities ballot for OUSU and many elections as my own college's RO, I therefore feel I have a good knowledge of the role and could do it justice.

For me, democratic accountability should come before everything our student union does. To this end, I would ensure integrity in OUSU elections, as I did when I was Returning Officer. Furthermore, I would make sure that information on how OUSU Council's elections work is provided at the start of the first council meetings in Michaelmas Term and lay the groundwork for Hilary's statutory elections.

Andrew Dwyer (Mansfield) – Asked if Joe Smith had been expelled from council, censured etc. or if that was an error on the form.

Matthew Collyer – Confirmed that was an error on the form.

Marina Lambrakis (St John's) – Pointed out that the annual elections would be in Hilary Term, not next term.

Fraser – Replied that he would still absolutely love to be Returning Officer.

Fraser Boistelle (New) was elected.

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

Cat Jones (Pembroke) – Urged council to read her last report to council, which goes through all of her manifesto pledges, including her particular highlights on suspension, lecture recording, and the

alternative prospectus.

Emily Silcock (New) – Urged council to read their reports. Informed council that she has finished pledge to reg, with over 4700 sending their voter registrations which was fantastic, that she is running an event tomorrow with free bike services at Radcliffe square, and that there will be an edible planting session outside the science parks.

Ali Lennon (St John's) – Informed council that this year has been incredibly challenging and rewarding, but that it has been very tough, where some days you change students' academic careers and lives, and other days are really bad, where you end up crying in the toilets. Explained that he has seen the best and worst of Oxford, that there are some really amazing people in the University, in OUSU, in the student body, and working behind the scenes. Stated that he has done his best to keep his manifesto, that he has not done everything and that the role has been very tricky. Reported that he has faced many complex and tricky issues, that he has been approached all hours of the day, in nightclub smoking areas and when going for pizza, meaning that anywhere he goes, he takes advice service cards with him. Reported that he has received a lot of abuse, as it is a role deals with difficult issues, which are emotionally charged and matter a lot to individual students, and when he disagrees or says that something is not possible, or that it is his day off, people have become very horrible, and he has received a barrage of personal abuse. Urged people to respect each other, treat each other with dignity and work together for Oxford students. Ended by saying that the sabbatical team, and the staff team in particular are incredible, and deserve our thanks. Wished the next team the best of luck.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Highlighted that 46% of the University students are graduate students, and that will get closer and closer to half. Noted that there are a lot of issues that affect graduate students, some of which are the same as those affecting undergraduates. Informed council they can read his report in full in details, and that it has been an amazing team to work with.

Lucy Delaney (Wadham) – Asked council to read her report in full, but stated that it has been an incredibly difficult and challenging year, but some really great things have been achieved, particularly surrounding consent workshops. Added that we managed to create a platform for other liberation workshops, and that there is a great deal of work to continue with this. Informed council that the majority of womens' officers' first responder trained, as well as whole freshers' committees and presidents. Recognised that she had not been able to do everything she wanted to this term, but acknowledged that it was OK, due to the amount of time she spent campaigning to stay in the NUS. Thanked the sabbatical team, OUSU staff, part time officers, campaigns and presidents.

Becky Howe (Pembroke) – Reported that this year has been really fantastic at times, challenging, often grueling, and sometimes heartbreaking. Stated that she has done most of things which she intended to do when she ran for the role including on lad culture, common room support, president training, rent negotiations, Oxford Festival, and finally, on the main reason that she ran, on mental health. Explained we now have a report, after 6000 students replied to the welfare survey. Urged that people continue to work on this, so Oxford is the accessible place that it needs to be. Stated that there have been challenging times, and she has been very shocked by the way that people sometimes treat student representatives, that she has received so much abuse online, that she has been called the enemy of democracy, the enemy of free speech, a tit, and a disgrace. Emphasized that people do these jobs because they really care about them, so encouraged people to keep that in mind, while still holding them to account, but being aware of when this changes from holding someone to account, to abuse. Wished the next team luck for the next year.

Adam Kellett (Herford) – Noted that access and admissions work is always down at this time of year due to exams, and urged council members to get their college members involved in access work.

e. Items for Resolution

1. Abortion Rights Re-Affiliation

Council notes:

1. OUSU is currently affiliated to Abortion Rights.
2. The last time OUSU Council voted to affiliate to Abortion Rights was 6th week of Trinity Term 2015.
3. It is required by the Education Act 1994 for Student Unions to report on external affiliations at least annually.
4. According to our Articles of Association (38.4), 'at least once in each Academic Year, the Board must submit the current list of affiliations to external organisations to Student Members for approval.'
5. According to our Bye-Laws (12.1) 'OUSU may only affiliate to an External Organisation following a Council or Referendum decision to that effect.'
6. Affiliation to Abortion Rights costs £75, which includes them sending us a pack of materials (stickers, posters etc.)
7. That OUSU has pro-choice policy, which resolves 'to support the right of all pregnant people to choose', 'to campaign to extend students' right of practical access to an abortion', and to 'extend their rights over their own pregnancies'.
8. That this policy further resolves 'to work with other groups campaigning for the above objects'.
9. That Abortion Rights is the only abortion-focused campaigning and advocacy organization in the UK, providing up-to-date information to campaigners and campaigning materials.

Council Believes:

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

Council Resolves:

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

Proposed: Lucy Delaney (Wadham)

Seconded: Becky Howe (Pembroke)

Lucy Delaney (Wadham) – Informed council that she would like to withdraw the motion. Explained that after research and a lot of talks with people, she does not feel that Abortion Rights have delivered on their promises to be more trans inclusive, and this was a stipulation of last year's affiliation. Noted that last year, we reaffirmed our policy on pro-choice, which will be in place for 3 years, and then re-affiliated to Abortion Rights in a follow up motion. Explained that it was pointed out that Abortion Rights was not trans inclusive, and that they have not since responded to her numerous emails or letter on this. Added that she looked up 'Abortion Rights – trans inclusion', and had one hit for just one resource showing any progress. Informed council that in 2014, and NUS Womens' Officer went to speak to Abortion Rights about the importance of trans-inclusion, but no progress was made. Recognised that this will leave a gap, but in conjunction with her successor she will be looking to affiliate to a different organisation, such as BPAS (British Pregnancy Advisory Service), along with the My Body, My Rights amnesty campaign. Noted that Abortion Rights do have

good staff, but that they have failed time and time again, after being lobbied repeatedly to take into account trans inclusivity. Stated that she does not feel she can push this motion through based on this, and that there will be a motion bringing a new affiliation in first week Michaelmas.

Sarah (St Catherine's) – Asked if that means that in the interim we will have no affiliation to any pro-choice organisation.

Lucy – Replied that that would be the case but that we have policy which is pro-choice. Apologised that she did not foresee this and have the time to draft a motion to BPAS prior to this meeting.

Sarah (St Catherine's) – Asked that if there is the opportunity for Lucy's successor to provide more information/guidance in light of this gap.

Lucy – Agreed that this is an important point, and we will be able to provide signposting, to these organisations, including Abortion Rights who can provide help. Noted that we can email resources to all womens' officers

Will Jarrett (Exeter) – Suggested that if we know that the My Body, My Rights campaign is good for trans inclusive abortion rights, that we just amend the motion to affiliate to them instead.

Lucy – Replied that that is a good point, but it seems a bit too complicated to amend on the spot and do it justice.

Motion withdrawn.

2. Motion to Accept the Trinity Term 2016 Scrutiny 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. The Scrutiny Committee must present a report evaluating the work of OUSU Sabbatical Officers and Part Time Executives to the termly council in 7th week.

Council Believes:

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

Council Resolves:

1. To accept the Scrutiny Report in the Appendix 1.

Proposed: Brendon Casey (St Edmund Hall)

Seconded: Joe Small (Jesus)

Brendon Casey (St Edmund Hall) – Noted that due to an administrative error, the scrutiny report is not available for the meeting. Proposed to table the report to 1st week Michaelmas.

Opposed.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Raised concern that there will be discussion about the six sabbatical officers at a meeting where they are not present. Added that he is concerned about the value of doing that, particularly at the first meeting of term, when a discussion will be held about people no longer in office, with people in the meeting who have no idea who they are. Noted that there may be value in discussing the part-time executive, suggesting that the motion is withdrawn, for the potential for one to return which just covers the part-time executive.

Brendon – Stated that he will leave it up to council to make that decision.

Jess (St John's) – Stated that it seems a shame to lose the scrutiny on the sabs completely, and asked if the report on the sabs can be circulated via email.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Recognised the problem with the sabs no longer being present to discuss the report in Michaelmas, however argued that we would be losing a third of the scrutiny work of this year if council do not discuss this, which should not be the case.

Ali Lennon (St John's) – Stated that he is uncomfortable with not being able to discuss/contest a report written about him. Suggested that we look into other options, perhaps including informal chats.

Cat Jones (Pembroke) – Stated that she does not feel passionately about this, but reminded council that anything that is online now is online forever, and she therefore would not want to gamble on what it will contain.

Dan Mead (St John's) – Informed council that he is also a member of scrutiny, but recognises what the sabs are saying, and would agree to withdrawing that part of the report.

Marina – Suggested that we send the reports to alternate email addresses of the outgoing sabs in September.

Lucy Delaney (Wadham) – Noted that it is very important that we can see it before it goes out, but that the most important thing is that we are held to account.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Suggested that the sabs are given the report to fact check during their last few weeks in office.

Tom Wadsworth (St John's) – Informed council that he doesn't really care what the process is, but the most important thing here is that we get to see the scrutiny report.

Ali – Explained that even if he has a chance to fact check it, he still wouldn't get a chance to stand up in front of council and speak about it.

Becky Howe (Pembroke) – Stated that it is vital that the report is seen, but recommended that we withdraw it now, and then have a conversation with scrutiny after the meeting about our best options.

Lucy – Asked about the possibility of an extraordinary meeting.

Nick – Reminded council that we would need 35 members and we would probably struggle.

Vote on tabling the motion to 1st week Michaelmas:

For – 9

Against – 30

Abstain – 7

Motion to table the motion fell.

Vote on withdrawing the motion:

For – 31

Against - 7

Abstain – 4

Motion withdrawn.

3. Supporting the relaunch of Oxide Radio

Council Notes:

1. That Oxide Radio (part of OUSU) is the radio station of Oxford University, providing a live platform open to all students and links to the broadcasting industry.
2. That other Universities such as Oxford Brookes and Cambridge have well equipped studios with modern hardware (Oxide kit is 7+ years old).
3. That Oxide Radio is missing key broadcasting equipment found as standard in other studios (for example a set of DJ decks).
4. That there has been a decline in the number of students broadcasting radio shows over the past 5 years.
5. That the station was relaunched in 2009 with additional OUSU funding.
6. That the Oxide team are planning a station relaunch MT 2016.
7. That the station budget per annum is £600, with licensing costs of ~£400 meaning an equipment budget of ~£200.
8. That radio equipment is expensive, for example a set of suitable DJ decks costing upwards of £700.

Council Believes:

1. That Oxide Radio should be maintained – continuing to provide Oxford University with a radio platform.
2. That the station should be relaunched to increase participation and popularity of the channel, avoiding becoming irrelevant and closing.

Council Resolves:

1. That OUSU should enable the station relaunch by making a one off financial contribution of £1000, allowing for the purchasing and replacement of equipment. Specifically, £900 of this used to purchase a pair of DJ decks (A used set of Pioneer CDJs cost around this amount) and

what remains used to purchase four sets of new headphones for the studio (which are currently in poor condition).

Proposed: James Clemoes, Exeter (Oxide Station Manager)

Seconded: Rob Rockwood, Exeter (Oxide Programme Controller)

Amendment received:

To change Resolves 1 from “financial contribution of £1000” to “the unspent remainder of the OUSU budget, allowing for further renovation of the radio studio”.

Proposed: James Clemoes (Exeter)

Seconded: Lachie Ayles (Wadham)

Matthew Collyer (New) – Confirmed that this adds approximately £31 on top of the £1000.

No objection to the amendment.

James Clemoes (Exeter) – Introduced himself as the station manager of Oxide radio, the only Oxford University radio station. Informed council that they have a team together who would very much like to re-launch the station, that are passionate about radio, and are very keen to get new equipment in place. Noted that a previous manager of Oxide radio has just gone on to do work on womens’ hour, and it is a great thing for students to get involved in. Added that they would like a brand new set of decks for the station, noting that they have requests from students on club nights who want to do shows, and want to make that possible.

Dan Mead (St John’s) – Noted that the station was previously re-launched in 2009, and asked how much the listenership went up then.

James – Replied that he does not know the stats from 2009, but has seen the schedule, when there were shows everyday, with the all the slots full.

Jess (St John’s) – Asked if they have any other sponsors for funding.

James – Replied that they intend to approach people over the summer.

Motion passed as amended with no opposition.

4. Global Justice Campaign

Council Notes:

1. Its powers under Bye-Law 34.2 to establish new campaigns, if a Sabbatical Officer supports this and provides a draft constitution.
2. Its endorsement of the Oxford Students’ Refugee Campaign in 1st Week Michaelmas Council 2015.
3. Its endorsement of Electronics Watch in 5th Week Trinity Council 2016.

Council Believes:

1. OUSU should facilitate student campaigning on global ethical issues, as part of student development.

2. There are multiple global ethical issues that students can campaign on, on a local scale, including refugee issues, tax-dodging and ethical procurement.

Council Resolves:

1. To create a new Campaign (pursuant to Bye-Law 34.2), called the Global Justice Campaign, which has the capacity to set up multiple sub-campaigns.
2. To endorse the draft constitution in Appendix 2. This sets out the provision for the campaign to create sub-campaigns to work on different issues.
3. To mandate the Vice President (Charity & Community) to form an Executive for the Campaign and ensure the Executive endorses the draft constitution within a month of this motion passing.

Proposed: Thomas Gardiner (Worcester)

Seconded: Emily Silcock (New College)

Emily Silcock (New) – Explained that this fits in with the re-structure of her campaigns, which she has already set out to council in her reports. Welcomed people to ask questions.

Motion passed with no opposition.

5. Graduate Vision

Council Notes:

1. That 46% of the University's students are graduate students, but that this is rarely reflected in turnout at OUSU events (including Council).
2. That the Sabbatical officer team have worked this year to investigate the reasons for poorer representation of graduate students, and to highlight the areas of greatest dissatisfaction among graduate students.
3. Several reports written by the Vice-President (Graduates) this year (on Masters satisfaction, DPhil supervisors and working conditions, and college provision), noting these areas of dissatisfaction and making recommendations for improvement.

Council Believes:

1. It is crucial for the colleges and University to provide an equivalent experience for graduate students (on taught and research programmes) to that of undergraduate students.
2. It is similarly crucial that OUSU is able to represent graduate students equally to undergraduate students, both by engaging more graduate students in its work, but also in ensuring graduate voices are heard even if in the minority.

Council Resolves:

1. To make the Graduate Vision in Appendix 3 OUSU Policy.
2. To mandate OUSU officers, but in particular the Sabbatical officers-elect, to consider the content of the Graduate Vision and consider how better to represent graduate students going forward.
3. That as they are now covered in the Graduate Vision, and as many are due to lapse anyway, to overturn current Policy Guidelines named: *OUSU response to University consultation on Part-Time Students, Castle Mill, Graduate Accommodation Guarantee for 1st years, and Standards of Research Supervision.*

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Marina Lambrakis (St John's)

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Informed council that he has written a document on what the priorities should be for OUSU and the University when it comes to graduates students going forward. Noted that it encourages the incoming team to ensure that their work represents graduate students as much as it represent undergraduate students.

Wadham student – Stated that the vision is fantastic but questioned the first point which says we will work to have on-time submissions and questioned the meaning.

Nick – Replied that he would be very happy to take an amendment on wording. Explained the purpose behind it was that when a lot of people run past their funded period, in the absence of other funding available, there are a lot of other supervisors who let these things drag out without recognising the problems there. Noted that he would happily change it to include a reference to funding which was the purpose behind it. Added that the other issue is that not everyone gets funding.

Amendment received:

In the Graduate Vision, under priorities for the collegiate university, to delete “on-time” and after rates, including “within a student’s funded period (if they have funding)”.

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Marina Lambrakis (St John's)

No opposition to amendment.

Motion passed as amended with no opposition.

6. Welfare Vision

Council Notes:

1. In Hilary Term 2016, 5,900 students responded to OUSU's Welfare Survey. The Survey collected qualitative (comments) as well as quantitative responses.
2. In Trinity Term 2015, OUSU Council voted to create an Education Vision, and an Access Vision is also coming to today's Council for approval.

Council Believes:

1. Visions are a valuable resource for the Student Union, to ensure a consistent and strategic approach to issues.
2. That student welfare should be a key priority of this University, and that OUSU should have a clear policy direction to campaign for the changes students want to see.

Council Resolves:

1. To approve and set as OUSU policy the Welfare Vision (attached as Appendix 4).

2. To mandate the Vice-President (Welfare and Equal Opportunities) and President to implement the Welfare Vision and its campaigning priorities, supported by the Vice-Presidents (Women) and (Graduates).
3. To mandate the Vice-President (Welfare and Equal Opportunities) and President to report annually on progress towards achieving the goals set out in the Vision.
4. To mandate OUSU Officers to review the Welfare Vision on a quinquennial basis, using an all-student consultation, such as the Welfare Survey.

Proposed: Becky Howe (Pembroke)

Seconded: Ali Lennon (St. John's)

Becky Howe (Pembroke) – Reminded council that they ran a welfare survey with over 6000 respondents, and the report is now ready. Informed council that it has lots of really interesting stuff in and will be available from tomorrow. Added that the vision pulls out the key priorities on how we need to improve welfare.

Amendment received:

To add to the Welfare Vision:

1. We acknowledge the funding crisis in national LGBTQ services, and will campaign against cuts to the Terrence Higgins Trust in Oxford.
2. We believe that students should be able to anonymously report queerphobia and queerphobic harassment within the University. We will explore the possibility of an online reporting and testimonial-sharing platform for this purpose.
3. We will lobby to ensure that training of the Proctors and the Assessor be introduced to ensure a fair and ~~proper~~ consistent functioning of the office.
4. We will lobby the University to provide thorough welfare and signposting training to all new and existing tutors and supervisors.
5. We recommend that colleges and halls scrutinise their own accessibility, and that work is done to ensure that the site and activity is inclusive of disabled students.
6. We will encourage colleges to have a greater awareness of reasonable adjustments disabled students may need in academic settings, such as tutorials.
7. We will work with colleges to clarify the process for examination adjustments for students with disabilities.
8. We recognise that a year abroad can be an isolating and challenging experience. Similarly, we recognise that part-time study, especially distance learning, can make support harder to access. We will lobby the University to create support routes for students who are not physically in Oxford, such as ensuring that they have a welfare point of contact within their college and department.
9. We recognise the negative impact of debt, hardship, and financial burden on many students' welfare, and welcome the current review of hardship provision. We will support and lobby for models of financial support that take a holistic view of the student's situation, taking into account factors such as family estrangement. We will lobby the University to also consider the financial needs of students who are transitioning.

To remove from the Welfare Vision:

- Entire section on the Proctors' Office

Proposed: Becky Howe (Pembroke)

Seconded: Ali Lennon (St. John's)

No opposition to the amendment.

Motion passed as amended with no opposition.

7. Access Vision

Council Notes:

1. Its decision in Michaelmas Term 2015 to mandate the creation of an Access Vision, setting out students' (and therefore, OUSU's) medium-term stances and campaigning priorities in the area of undergraduate and graduate access.
2. The focus groups and online form used to consult on the creation of a first draft, and development of a final draft.
3. That our existing Education Vision currently contains a small section on access.

Council Believes:

1. It is imperative that potential students are not deterred from applying to Oxford, at undergraduate or postgraduate level, due to factors such as finance, class, race, or the many other barriers that exist.
2. It is important for OUSU to clarify its strategic priorities in terms of access, in order to campaign effectively.
3. It is also a good opportunity to update the Education Vision, in line with material now in the Access Vision, and to incorporate parts of OUSU's Student Written Submission to the recent Higher Education Review.

Council Resolves:

1. To adopt the Access Vision in Appendix 5 as OUSU Policy, subject to discussion (and, if necessary, amendments) on several items including:
 - a. how the collegiate University should engage in curriculum and achievement at school-level;
 - b. whether we support a sector-wide move to post-qualification undergraduate applications.
2. To make the amendments in Appendix 6 to Policy in the Education Vision.
3. That as they are now covered in the Education and Access Visions, to overturn current Policy named: *Application fees for postgraduate entry, Postgraduate Loan consultation, and Complaints and Appeals in the Collegiate University.*

Proposed: Cat Jones (Pembroke)

Seconded: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Amendment

To add Council Believes 4: It is important to support student initiatives to improve access.

And Council Resolves 4: To support the Harun Ur Rashid Memorial Scholarship and other similar bursaries and scholarships that improve access to education at Oxford.

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Rizwana Rashid (St Cross)

Amendment 2

Add Council Believes 4: It is inappropriate for departments to schedule classes (or other core teaching) at times that are detrimental to student welfare, and particularly that impact negatively on groups such as student parents and carers.

Add Council Resolves 4: To add to the Education Vision, after the fifth bullet point in Teaching and Learning: We will oppose the holding of any compulsory or core classes (or other teaching) in evenings (especially after 7pm) or at weekends, unless students specifically, and unanimously, request this.

Add Council Resolves 5: To express its opposition to the Law Faculty's recent proposal to hold certain classes on the Bachelor of Civil Law or Magister Juris programme after 7pm.

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Cat Jones (Pembroke)

Cat Jones (Pembroke) – Noted that we have received lots and lots of positive feedback, and lots of suggestions, all of which have been incorporated. Informed council that the changes which were non-controversial she put straight in, however the ones that she did not feel comfortable making an executive decision on have been highlighted in red, to receive a steer from council. Asked if we need to caveat that within race and school type that there are other really important sub-groups, such as between different ethnicities, or between comprehensive schools and grammar schools.

No objection to keeping this in.

Cat – Continued on to the second point, explaining that when this last came to council, identifying as LGBTQ was not on there as an access barrier, as from the data we have LGBTQ students are not under-represented in Oxford. Acknowledged that there are a huge number of barriers that face LGBTQ students, some of which are acknowledged elsewhere.

Taisie (Wadham) – Suggested that adding a phrase such as identifying as LGBTQ could have an impact, such as a trans student having to change school.

Mansfield student – Stated that she thought it should be included, and added that LGB and T students could be separated out, as all groups are very different, and should not be lumped together.

Cat – Moved on to a point on how the University should be intervening in schools, which refers to curriculum reform, raising attainment, etc. Noted that we are all in agreement that they should be doing loads at the point that people apply, or are thinking about applying, but this is about earlier than that. Asked council if the detail that has been added seems appropriate.

No objection to this inclusion.

Cat – Explained suggestion received that we support UCAS deciding across the whole of the sector that they would no longer accept year 12 applications, and the whole sector would move to applications in year 13, after you have your results, with the idea that you don't disadvantage students who under-estimate themselves in year 12.

Emily Silcock (New) – Noted that there could be access arguments the other way around, as you are much more likely to have to support yourself through that year, and therefore end up in a job that you don't want to leave to go to University.

Cat – Agreed and noted that she would caveat the comment with the fact that it should be a quicker application process, rather than a full year.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Suggested that for a policy document, it might be worth having a discussion on this specific point.

Cat – Agreed to include the word consider, so Eden has the option to look into it further, and amend/remove it if necessary.

Taisie – Asked how the interview system would work and how it could happen in two months.

Cat – Replied that results would need to be put much earlier, so this would need to be a sector-wide discussion.

Taisie – Asked if interviews would still happen.

Cat – Replied that Oxford would have to sort that out.

Matthew Dawe (St Hugh's) – Asked if this would disadvantage international students who will potentially be coming from different education systems, where you will not be able to lobby these kind of changes in exams, and therefore may be made to take a year out.

Cat – Agreed that that was a very useful point, and she didn't know when international qualifications fell, noting that this is now enough caveats that she will just take it out, and allow this conversation to be picked up next year.

Cat – Asked about the comments on language barriers at interview for international students, and also on sending tutors to more countries than we do currently, to conduct more interviews overseas.

Adam Kellett (Hertford) – Asked if in addition to skype interviews for international students, if it would be worth considering skype interviews for those based in the UK who are unable to travel for their interview.

Cat – Replied that yes, potentially, however noted that it is seen to be an advantage to be interviewed personally which is why some international students prefer to have a personal interview. Cautioned that if we make a face to face interview optional, there may be particular disadvantaged groups who feel that they have to opt for skype .

Eden – Would be pro removing the clause about having more interviews outside of the UK, and would encourage more talks about this before it is included.

Cat – Agreed to amend the last point to be to consider the pros and cons of skype versus in person for home and international students.

Motion passed as amended with no opposition.

8. White Paper Response

Council Notes:

1. The Government’s White Paper on the future of higher education, which proposes (among other things):
 - a. the easier creation and abolition of universities;
 - b. the creation of a new “Teaching Excellence Framework” (TEF) whereby universities are assessed for the quality of their teaching against given metrics and criteria;
 - c. the potential for differentiated home/European Union undergraduate tuition fees from 2019-2020 based on a university’s TEF rating, and increased tuition fees from 2017-18 in any case.
2. OUSU’s response to the Green Paper (which preceded the White Paper), which, based on student consultation, opposed the metrics proposed for the TEF, increased tuition fees, and in particular, differentiated tuition fees based on “quality”.
3. That responses from OUSU, other students’ unions, the National Union of Students and universities led to notable differences between the proposals in the Green Paper and the White Paper (for example, the stalling of differential fee increases and the scrapping of plans to exempt universities from the Freedom of Information Act).
4. That OUSU responded to a consultation on the National Student Survey last year, and there is an ongoing consultation on the “Destination of Leavers from Higher Education” (DLHE) survey, which measures graduate employment and which is proposed for use as a metric in the TEF.

Council Believes:

1. The metrics proposed for the TEF (including the National Student Survey, data on graduate employment from the DLHE, and dropout rates) are poor proxies for the quality of teaching at a university, and will not improve standards or improve the student experience.
2. Increased and differential tuition fees could prove detrimental to access initiatives – particularly at universities like Oxford, who are likely to achieve the highest TEF rating, to increase tuition fees accordingly, and potentially to put applicants off applying here as a result.

Council Resolves:

1. To permit the Sabbatical officers to respond on OUSU's behalf to the two consultations on the Teaching Excellence Framework (a draft response is in **Appendix 7**) and the DLHE survey, provided that a substantive draft of each is sent to all students for consultation before submission.
2. To mandate the Sabbatical Officers to lobby for the University of Oxford not to opt in to the Teaching Excellence Framework from Year 2, and to work with other students' unions to encourage a wider refusal to opt-in to the TEF as it stands.

Proposed: Cat Jones (Pembroke)

Seconded: Becky Howe (Pembroke)

Cat Jones (Pembroke) – Noted that their draft is in the very early stages, and will be improved with the incoming sabs who will be responsible for the final submission of it. Promised an all -student consultation, giving everyone the option to have their say before it is submitted.

Tom Wadsworth (St John's) – Asked why it refers to opting out of year 2, rather than year 1.

Cat – Explained that year 1 is not optional, and that Oxford will automatically qualify as we have QAA approval and have met UK expectations.

Motion passed with no opposition.

9. Action Against Fee Increases

OUSU Notes:

1. The government's May 2016 White Paper outlined extensive reforms to higher education.
2. The flagship reform, the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), will rely on data from the National Student Survey (NSS) and Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey.
3. Institutions which score highly in the TEF will be able to raise fees in line with inflation from 2017-19, followed by even higher level fees in 2019-20. (1)
4. The University of Sheffield Students' Union has already passed this motion (2) and it is being debated at SU's across the country
5. There are many other ways in which Oxford students' voices can be heard in terms of improving quality of teaching and giving feedback to new teaching staff. For example Academic Affairs Officers run subject specific surveys in many Common Rooms, faculties have student representatives within them, and surveys such as the OUSU welfare survey take a much more comprehensive look at student welfare across the entire student body than the NSS currently does

OUSU Believes:

1. The reforms fundamentally attack the idea of education as a public service.
2. There are many reasons to oppose NSS, e.g. that it systematically discriminates against BME academics. (3)
3. Sabotaging NSS and DLHE will disrupt the introduction of TEF, giving us leverage.
4. Boycotting the NSS would discredit the use of the survey in higher education reforms.

5. Any action against the NSS and DLHE should be undertaken in solidarity with students across the country since tackling this issue as an Oxford-only issue would be ineffective and will not result in change we want.

OUSU Resolves:

1. To organise a boycott/sabotage of NSS and DLHE, including:
2. Refusing to promote NSS or have any pro-NSS material with the OUSU logo on;
3. In Michaelmas 2016 running a campaign collecting pledges from finalists to boycott/sabotage the NSS;
4. Working with UCU to discourage NSS promotion by academics and encourage academics to actively promote the sabotage instead;
5. Promoting the sabotage through posters, leafleting, and social media especially when the survey is released;
6. Taking part in national actions and demonstrations linked to the NSS boycott/sabotage.
7. To work with the University and UCU to create and actively promote local, non-metric-focused alternatives to NSS to assess and thereby improve students' learning experiences. Furthering the system of academic affairs feedback in colleges as well as promoting student engagement on a faculty level

Proposer: James Cain (St. Johns)

Secunder: Lily Mactaggart (Hertford)

Lily Mactaggart (Hertford) – Explained that the NUS have called on student unions to boycott the NSS, in order to remove a metric for the TEF, which is a really bad system.

Andrew Dwyer (Mansfield) – Asked if we would wait until next year to boycott it, as it is then it will impact on fees.

Cat – Replied that the TEF will work retrospectively on the results of the last three years of the NSS. Supported the motion as a strong statement.

Amendment

Add Council Believes 6: The data collected from the annual Student Barometer survey remains of use in lobbying for change in departments, and the University more widely.

Add Council Resolves 8: To continue to promote completion of the Student Barometer survey among undergraduate and graduate students, and to encourage the University to consider extending this to final-year undergraduates.

Add Council Resolves 9: In the Education Vision (part of OUSU Policy), under *Student engagement and representation*, after “We will continue to facilitate high completion rates of national and institutional surveys”, insert “including the Student Barometer, but not including the National Student Survey (given its link to the Teaching Excellence Framework)”.

Proposed: Cat Jones (Pembroke)

Seconded: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Amendment accepted as friendly.

Dan Mead (St John's) – Asked what the NUS position on this is, as we have used boycott/sabotage.

Becky Howe (Pembroke) - Replied that she does not know the exact wording but believes that it is boycott.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Added that other student unions have passed similar motions.

Eloise (Mansfield) – Raised a comment from her JCR – We need to keep this survey; it is one of the few data sets which we have to compare student experiences between colleges. It is carefully considered by the governing body of Mansfield and I don't understand this considering the time we have devoted to increasing student turnout in this survey. Oxford performs well in student experience.

Nick Cooper (St John's) – Added that Q23 on student unions is being removed from the NSS so it will be no benefit of us whatsoever. Added that we still have the student barometer.

Jess (St John's) – Argued that the data from the NSS is still very useful to OUSU and the barometer is not as well developed.

Cat – Replied that she found the barometer far more useful, as have many student reps. Added that if you go on Oxford student barometer, you can split it up by college/student/course, as well as having specific Oxford/OUSU questions.

Motion passed as amended with no opposition.

10. OUSU's Policies on International Students and Visas

Council Notes:

1. OUSU has three existing policies regarding international students and visas, two of which are due to lapse this term.
2. Over 40% of Oxford students (19% of undergraduates; 63% of graduates) are citizens of countries other than the UK - 25% from outside the European Union, and 15% from EU countries.

Council Believes:

1. International students play a crucial role in the student community, and should be supported during their time at the University.
2. The Government should remove unfair restrictions on international students, including overly restrictive and expensive visas, and unfair additional charges such as for NHS use.
3. 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.
4. The University should work to ensure that international offer-holders and students are assisted as much as possible, especially with respect to visas.

Council Resolves:

1. 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.

2. 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. To make all of Council Believes and Council Resolves 1 and 2 OUSU Policy, and as it is now covered by this motion, to overturn the current Policy entitled *Tier 4 Visa Students* (and to allow *UKBA Monitoring* and *NUS Conference 2013 – Reinstate the PSW Visa Route* to lapse).

Proposed: Meera Sachdeva (LMH)

Seconded: Marcelo Gennari do Nascimento (Wadham)

Marcelo Gennari do Nascimento (Wadham) – Stated that he really wants OUSU to have a voice on this issue, which is restricting work and opportunities for international students.

Motion passed with no opposition.

Below the line:

11. Associate Membership

Council Notes:

1. LMH is introducing a new Access scheme from the academic year 2016/17 called the 'LMH Foundation Year'
2. Students on this scheme will not be fully registered or matriculated members of the university, but will be integrated into college life as essentially a full student
3. There is a danger that Foundation Year students will not have sufficient representation in dealings with the University or individual Colleges if they are not JCR members or OUSU members
4. Foundation Year students should also have access to essential OUSU services such as welfare provision, the liberation campaigns, etc.
5. LMH JCR has adopted Foundation Year students as full JCR members
6. The current Bye-Laws only give associate membership to those in categories 18.1a and 18.1b
 - a. Adding clause 18.1c allows for fuller flexibility in adding new groups, such as the LMH Foundation Year Students, to associate membership of OUSU and means that repeated Bye-Law changes will be unnecessary should other colleges adopt such a scheme

Council Believes:

1. OUSU has a commitment to support Access and Outreach schemes like the LMH Foundation Year
2. OUSU has a commitment to representing the views of the whole body of students, including those who are not necessarily fully matriculated members
3. Such a change to the Bye-Laws to allow for more flexibility will help not only the LMH Foundation Year Students, but any future similar schemes that may be set up

Council Resolves:

1. To give a Final Reading to replace Bye-Law 18.1 with:

18.1 A person included in a class of associate membership established by the Board under Article 8.1, and who is not a Student, is an Associate Member. Classes are:

- (a) persons admitted by the University to
 - (i) the Register of Visiting Students, or*
 - (ii) the Register of Recognised Students,**
- (b) persons studying for a certificate or diploma of the University, and*
- (c) such other classes as the Board (having consulted the University) may establish.*

2. To encourage the Trustee Board to make the LMH Foundation Year students a class of Associate Members before Michaelmas Term 2016, if these amendments pass.

3. To give a Final Reading to make minor and consequential amendments to the Bye-Laws in accordance with Appendix 8 (which contains the new wording of all amended Bye-Laws).

Proposed: Joe Hill (LMH)

Seconded: Emma Andrews (LMH)

Motion passed with no discussion.

12. Consequential Amendments to Campaign Constitutions

Council Notes:

1. Recent changes to OUSU's governing documents approved by Council, 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.
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 Campaign constitutions, as provided in track-changes format in Appendix 9.

Proposed: Nick Cooper (St John's)

Seconded: Cat Jones (Pembroke)

Motion passed with no discussion.

f. Items for Debate

3. OUSU Council Voting Reform - Requested by Will Jarrett (Exeter) and Laura Cheftel (Exeter) (15 minutes)

The current voting system used in OUSU Council gives a maximum of three votes to each college – one for the president, one for the OUSU rep, and one for the president-appointed third person. I think there are a number of problems with this system, including the following:

- No matter how many votes an OUSU rep gets from their college, their **votes are always reduced down to just one**. This is 1) undemocratic and unrepresentative, and 2) makes it very difficult for OUSU reps to convince people to vote.
- This first-past-the-post style of taking votes from colleges means that **significant minorities are disregarded**. For instance, if 70% voted 'yes' on a motion, and 30% voted 'no', the 'no' votes are completely discounted.
- As the presidents are able to choose who gets the third vote, 67% of voting power is theoretically with the presidents. This means that 67% of **voting power is out of the hands of the majority** of voters (the JCRs and MCRs).
- The third vote system could theoretically be manipulated to provide **extra voting power for unpopular or controversial motions**, which is wholly undemocratic.

I have an idea for a new system of voting, and I would love to hear opinions/ideas about how to improve it. My idea for a new system is as follows:

- Before the fortnightly OUSU Council, **an online vote would be circulated to the whole university**. This could be done centrally, or via OUSU reps, as is the case currently. OUSU reps would be expected to encourage turnout in their colleges.
- The voting results would then come back to OUSU, and would be **collated before the beginning of the Council meeting**.
- This popular vote, which includes the votes of every individual voter, would amount to 50% of the entire vote. **The other 50% would come from the presidents**, who would vote during the Council meeting, with the benefit of having heard and participated in debate before voting occurs, as is the case currently.
- A **simple majority** is required to pass a motion, as is the case currently.
- OUSU reps would still be able to **speak in opposition to motions**.

I think there are a number of benefits to this system:

- It would allow **every Oxford student a vote** in every motion.
- There is **no chance of an OUSU rep voting contrary to their JCR/MCR**, which is a possibility under the current system.
- Presidents retain half the vote, meaning that **debates and discussions are still central** in OUSU Council decision making.

I can think of some negatives too – any thoughts on how to minimise these would be appreciated:

- There is the problem of **how to deal with the popular vote when amendments are made** to motions (although this is also a problem with the current system).
- It would make **quick maths** on the part of the Returning Officer a necessity (as they would have to convert the presidents' votes into a percentage, then add those figures to the popular vote, to resolve each motion).

I would love to hear general feedback on this idea, or suggestions for better alternative systems, or advice on practical elements of the proposal (e.g. how to distribute the vote). I plan to put this proposal to Council in 1st week Michaelmas, so any thoughts now would be gratefully received.

Eden Bailey (Magdalen) – Proposed a procedural motion to table this discussion to the next meeting of council.

Matthew Collyer (New) – Replied that as it is not a motion, it cannot officially be tabled.

Will Jarrett (Exeter) – Asked if it could be circulated by email.

Matthew – Agreed.

Discussion withdrawn.