**3rd Week Michaelmas Term 2023 Student Council**

**TIME: 17:30**

**DATE: Tuesday 24th October 2023**

**LOCATION: Exeter College**

If you have any questions about Student Council, please feel free to contact:   
**Chair of Oxford SU Council: chair@oxfordsu.ox.ac.uk**

**SU Staff: studentengagement@oxfordsu.ox.ac.uk**
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1. Policy For an Intercollegiate and Interdepartmental Campaign to Keep Campsfield Closed (Jenna Ali, St Hugh’s) **Content Warning: Self-harm, suicide, and xenophobia.**

2. Ethical Investment Governance Review (Mia Clement, Oxford SU)

3. LGBTQ+ and Trans-Inclusive Sports (Mia Clement, Oxford SU) **Content Warning: Transphobia.**

4. Creation of an Environmental Affairs Campaign for Social and Environmental Justice (Mia Clement, Oxford SU)
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**I. Project Proposals for resolution**

1. Science Policy Discussions (Kai Sandbrink, LMH)

2. Ethical, Decentralised, Democratic Social Media (Tom Campbell, Univ)

**J. Items for Discussion**

1. Free Speech and the Oxford Union (Luca di Bona, St Hilda’s) **Content Warning: Racism, islamophobia, homophobia, transphobia, antiziganism, fatphobia, and antisemitism.**

2. The change to move Student Council from 4 meetings a term to 2 (Danial Hussain, Oxford SU)

**K.** Any other business

**A. Minutes of the previous meeting**

See Week 7 Trinity 2023, and Week 8 Trinity 2023: <https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/minutes/>

**B. Matters arising from the minutes**

**C. Elections in Council**

**Item C: Elections in Council:**

* **Returning Officer (RO) Election:**
  + **Candidate: Joe Bell**
    - Mentioned experience as RO last year.
    - Identified major issue of lack of handover from last year.
    - Proposed solutions: Introduction of a Candidate guide and creating more avenues for proper comparison between candidates.
  + **Question:**
    - **Emma:** Inquired about Joe’s simultaneous candidacy for Elections Committee and how he plans to balance both roles.
    - **Joe:** Clarified that he would not assume both roles if elected as RO.

**Result: Joe Bell was duly elected Returning Officer**

* **Elections for Steering Committee:**
  + **Minute-taker:** Nick Harris, VP PG Education and Access, took minutes for transparency and to eliminate bias.
  + **Alternate Member:** Noted that four out of eight candidates were present for speeches.
    - **Candidate: Niall Pearson-Shaul (he/him)**
      * Mentioned experience within Merton JCR and working on the rules working group for the last two years.
      * Expressed desire to bring his knowledge and experience of the rules to the steering committee.
      * Aimed to help create enduring and useful documents for the future and to give students more autonomy.
    - **Candidate: Shermar Pryce (he/him)**
      * Noted a year of experience attending Student Council, highlighted position as JCR president from Univ.
      * Wants to introduce elements that will draw individuals who do not typically engage with SU communications.
      * Mentioned that for the last three weeks, has been assisting with democracy work at the SU .
    - **Candidate: Eleanor Miller (she/her)**
      * Identified as Co-chair of Class Act and Charities Officer for Wadham.
      * Mentioned lack of extensive Student Council experience but has the desire to make it accessible for students to get involved.
    - **Candidate: Raihan Rahman** 
      * Stated no experience within Student Council but was motivated to join after receiving an email.
      * Mentioned past roles as a journalist and lawyer.
      * Wants to channel a representative perspective through the Student Union.
* **Result: Niall Pearson-Shaul and Eleanor Miller are duly elected to Steering Committee**

**D. Reports from and questions to Sabbatical Trustees**

Written reports can be found here: <https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/>

**President:** Projects include a College Disparity Report, an SU Review, SU Governance enhancements, creation of a New Norrington Table, and efforts to boost SU Engagement. Additionally, he mentions key interactions with Heads of Colleges, JCR Presidents, and engagements in EDI (Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion) initiatives, like a roundtable discussion and a student tour at the Pitt Rivers Museum, to further the SU's objectives and foster better relationships among university stakeholders.

**Vice-President Activities & Community:** reported on her pledges and projects regarding climate education, biodiversity, and community engagement. They mentioned collaborations with various university and external bodies, and detailed several ongoing and upcoming initiatives like Inside Oxford Research, Two Tales of One City, and Oxford Climate Forum. Mia also outlined her extensive engagement in meetings and events aimed at promoting climate awareness, inclusivity, and community interaction. Future events and engagements, continuing the dialogue and action on their pledges, were also provided.

**Vice-President Liberation and Equality:** Projects encompass liaising with BME staff networks for race equality policy renewal and Bronze award, involving LGBTQ campaigns in decision-making processes, and enhancing EDI workshops with Prof Tim. Initiatives like "Liberation Letters" and advocacy for Oxford Sanctuary status for refugees are highlighted. Key events include EDI Round Table and Student rep event with Prof Tim focusing on EDI campaigns at Oxford. Future engagements comprise of "Liber-Tea and Equali-Tea" event, "Liberation Weeks", and a Cultural Fair aimed at fostering community building and enhancing liberation and equality dialogues.

**Vice-President Postgraduate Access and Education:** Projects include the exploration of creating a graduate student union, doubling postgraduate representation at the division, and increasing graduate accommodation availability. Notable meetings were with Joint Fees & Student Support Advisory Group discussing student tuition increases, and Finance and Risk Committee concerning the funding model of Oxford University Students Union. Upcoming events include the University Council meeting on October 30th, where tuition increases will be argued against. Extensive committee engagements are highlighted, emphasizing the multifaceted responsibilities associated with his role.

**VP Undergraduate Access and Education:** Projects include developing an Academic Bridging Scheme, advocating for social class training during Freshers' week, and launching an Academic Peer Support Network. Key meetings with Quality Assurance Sub-Group and Sub-Committee provide insights into academic provisions and industrial action impacts. Upcoming events like Rent Negotiation Training and Student Solidarity Event with the UCU are mentioned, along with regular engagements with various university and college committees to enhance student access and education.

Q: Have you communicated with other student-oriented unions, besides UCU?

A: Expressed willingness to explore such communication.

**Vice-President (Welfare):** Projects involve drafting a survey on sexual violence, lobbying against sexual violence in city centre Oxford, and enhancing mental health support. Initiatives like promoting E-Learning Online Consent Training and revising terms for Student Democracy and Engagement Subcommittee are highlighted. Key meetings include Welfare Forum, Joint Student Mental Health Committee, and Working Group for Sexual Misconduct discussing mental health and sexual misconduct concerns. Upcoming events include Gender RepCom, Joint Student Mental Health Committee, and LGBT+ Advisory Group Meeting focusing on student mental health and welfare training.

Q: Clarification requested on the terms of reference for student democracy committee.

A: Mentions committee is going through stages of approval and more information will be provided.

Q: Query on work on Harassment and sexual violence?

A: Working a lot with working groups addressing these matters, and working to ensure students know support services are available.

**E. Reports from and questions to LGBTQ+ Campaign, Disabilities Campaign, Women\*s Campaign, and Class Act.**

Written reports can be found here: <https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/>

**LGBTQ+ Campaign Report:**

During Pride Month, events such as a placard making session, a series of talks/Q&As, and a queer climbing event were organized. However, the planned Gala event did not materialize. Work on Sexual Health Resources included the organization of an STI drop-in session and the continuation of the peer-led LGBTQ+ Sexual Health education group. The Centralized Gender Expression Fund and Transphobia Definition projects did not progress as planned due to unsubmitted motions. On the financial front, £600 in donations was secured and a National Lottery Heritage fund application is in progress. Other new projects mentioned include the Safe Churches Report and a list of affirming queer books. The upcoming term targets include existing project continuation, new project initiation like Safe Faith Spaces and Trans Day/Week of Remembrance, and extending collaborations.

**Disabilities Campaign (DisCam) Report:**

Freshers fair engagement led to the initiation of a successful DisCam family scheme. Exploration of collecting case studies to better understand common issues faced by students was mentioned. Efforts to promote awareness of hidden disabilities were hampered due to difficulties in obtaining sunflower lanyards. A calendar of awareness days has been established, and a consultancy event with the SU is planned to guide strategy in supporting disabled students. Long-term projects include creating disability pledges for colleges and examining confidentiality policies between colleges and college GPs. Several social events are planned to foster community among students with disabilities.

Q: Inquiry about Campaign’s interaction with adh\_we.

**WomCam Report:**

A survey investigating the challenges women face in academia was launched and several community events were held. The Oxford Period proposal was promoted, with discussions held with sabbatical officers for further advancements. The upcoming term targets include producing a report based on the survey findings, planning further events in collaboration with other groups, and continuing work on the Oxford Period proposal by updating it based on feedback and proposing it to relevant university committees.

**Class Act Report:**

The Estranged Students Open Day was held successfully, and the Vacation Residence Project is in progress. The Financial Guide was compiled and published digitally, but a physical booklet could not be produced due to financial constraints. About 15 events are being run this term, though the plan to invite speakers was hindered due to restrictions. The Class Act Families initiative was successful in matching students for support. Thanks to JCR donations, the campaign is in a stable financial position for the rest of the term. Upcoming targets include working with OMA to increase volunteer numbers, inviting speakers in the next term, publishing more guides to demystify different parts of Oxford life, and advancing projects like redefining classism and drafting an open letter against rent and cost of living raises.

Q: How do we sign up to the family scheme?

A: Information on website.

**F. Reports from and questions to Divisional Representatives for MPLS and Social Sciences.**

Written reports can be found here: <https://www.oxfordsu.org/representation/student-council/>

**MLPS Undergraduate Report:**

Under the representation of Aneshka Moudry, the MLPS Undergraduate division has been active in restructuring the UG Joint Consultative Forum, which had been dissolved due to a lack of engagement. Aneshka is awaiting a list of student reps to collaborate with the MPLS Divisional office to reestablish the forum. Currently, the focus is on arranging a Teams channel, meetings, and understanding the previous lapses of the UG Joint Consultative Forum to ensure its successful reformation. Aneshka has also taken a step to join the Chemists’ Joint Consultative Committee (CJCC) to gain deeper insights into issues from the undergraduate student body at the departmental level.

**MLPS Postgraduate Report:**

Daiki Tagami, representing the postgraduate division of MLPS, has actively engaged in addressing division-wide issues particularly concerning conference funds. In the MPLS Divisional Meeting and GJCF Meeting, the focus was on conference funds, living costs, and teaching responsibilities. Daiki initiated a shared document among all departmental representatives to gather information regarding available funds. The aim is to advocate for sufficient funding for DPhil students to participate in national and international conferences, emphasizing equitable distribution of funds. The process of gathering funds information is in motion, and Daiki plans to make a proposal in the MPLS divisional meeting post completion of this document.

**SS Undergraduate Report:**

Callum Lloyd, representing the undergraduate division of Social Sciences, has engaged in addressing student visa changes, which have significantly increased the immigration health surcharge and limited a student's ability to bring dependents. Although these changes are government decisions and beyond the university's control, the university is actively lobbying against them. Currently, Callum is awaiting the election of departmental course representatives, post which a broader program of student representation will be implemented. His overarching aim for the academic year is to provide students with certainty, particularly concerning examination formats and marking, within the context of industrial action.

**SS Postgraduate Report:**

Emma Somos, in the postgraduate division of Social Sciences, has actively voiced concerns regarding the rising visa costs for international students in the Divisional Board Meeting. The issue significantly impacts EU students, with some unable to take up their offers due to higher visa, tuition fee, and living costs. Emma advocated for the expansion of scholarships and government lobbying to address this issue. She also highlighted the need for research opportunities and interaction with recruiting professors, a concern she plans to address at a departmental level once course reps are elected. Emma is also awaiting a meet-up with last year's representative and Sumeyye, the Humanities PG Division Rep, scheduled for November 8th.

**G. Report: SU 2023/24 Budget**

SU President: The Oxford SU's financial position was discussed, detailing the budget approval process and the changes faced during 2022/23 due to the disbandment of the Joint Subcommittee of Education Committee. This led to a delayed budget review by the PRAC Committee in July. An apology was issued for not reporting the budget to the student council in the trinity term. A new committee, the "Student Life Sub Committee," has been formed to streamline the budget approval process in future. The report also highlighted the approved budget for 2023/24, which, despite a request for increased grant funding due to a spike in inflation, saw a cut forcing a restructure, particularly impacting staff numbers, now reduced to 17 from 33 in 2017. However, a new commercial partnership has been formed, ensuring a guaranteed income of £795,568 over the next four years from advertisement revenue, with a projection of 10% growth yearly. Despite budget reductions, efforts have been made to maintain core student-facing functions, such as no increased costs for student societies at the freshers’ fair. A proactive approach is underway to channel increased profits from commercial projects back to student functions, with a dedicated project staff member overseeing these initiatives. The SU reassures its commitment to the student body amidst financial challenges, viewing the current budget as a viable path to continue supporting students effectively.

Q: Commented on the profitability of the Freshers' fair and asked for the reason behind its success.

A: Hosting the event at the University Parks incurred higher costs compared to the Exam Schools.

Q: Inquired about the shift to Exam Schools and its expected impact on expenditure.

A: The change is anticipated in 2026 and precise information regarding the impact on expenditure is not yet available.

Q: Asked for clarification on which organisation is the commercial partner?

A: Clarified the company is called Native.

Q: Inquired if the SU maintains a list of advertising companies along with the income generated from them.

A: Native operates in accordance with SU policies.

Q: Raised a question regarding the possibility of paying the representatives at the SU minimum wage.

A: It is not on the agenda, but encouraged the proposal of a motion for consideration.

**H. Items for resolution**

1. **Policy For An Intercollegiate and Interdepartmental Campaign to Keep Campsfield Closed** Proposer: Jenna Ali, St Hugh’s   
Seconder: Benjamin Matthews, St Hugh’s   
**Content Warning: Self-harm, suicide, and xenophobia.**

**Speech:** The motion highlights empirical evidence of the adverse effects of immigration detention on individuals' health, referencing the closure and planned reopening of Campsfield House detention centre despite previous commitments by the government to reduce such detentions. It acknowledges local political and civil opposition to the reopening, and identifies Oxford as a designated UK City of Sanctuary. The motion mentions the efforts of the Coalition to Keep Campsfield Closed (CKCC) in campaigning against the reopening, including an Open Letter to the Prime Minister. It recognizes the SU and Student Council's existing support for CKCC's agenda and underlines the importance of student engagement in local social issues, particularly those impacting asylum-seekers and BAME communities. The motion resolves to make CKCC campaigning a supported policy by Sabbatical Officers, outlining various actions to promote the campaign through JCRs, MCRs, and university-wide communication channels.

Q - Why is this important?

A - Expresses the ultimate purpose is to show solidarity and recognise support for Refugees in general, whether it be in Campsfield or elsewhere.

**Results:**

**Total votes: 36**

**Votes for:  34**

**Votes against: 0**

**Abstentions:  2**

**MOTION DEEMED TO BE CARRIED**

2. **Ethical Investment Governance Review**

Proposer: Mia Clement, Oxford SU   
Seconder: Jennifer Lynam, Oxford SU

**Speech:** The motion discusses the lack of formal engagement with the Sabbatical Officer representative in the only EIRRS meeting of the year, expressing concerns about the progress on OUem’s net zero portfolio engagement, and the perceived lack of clear avenues for formally elevating such concerns. The motion suggests that the Students' Union has been the primary body holding OUem accountable on its sustainability investment strategy, despite this being a university commitment. It articulates concerns regarding the reduction in ESG engagements, increase in fossil fuel exposure, and perceived low ambition of targets set by OUem. Throughout the year, the Sabbatical Officer for Charities and Community has repeatedly raised concerns and made suggestions to improve net zero engagement, though responses to these efforts have been slow and a formal meeting to discuss these concerns was never arranged. The motion reflects a belief in the importance of climate divestment and the need for environmental sustainability to be adequately represented in investment decisions and the governance of the university’s endowment fund. It resolves to mandate the VP Activities & Community to work with the university's environmental sustainability team to improve governance on ethical investment and climate divestment, and to collaborate with colleges on managing their own environmental and ethical investment efforts.

Q: Questions if the motion passing will act as justification to the University in order to assist with what the motion seeks to achieve

A: Notes this is correct.

**Results:**

**Total votes: 33**

**Votes for:  32**

**Votes against: 1**

**Abstentions: 0**

**MOTION DEEMED TO BE CARRIED**

3. **LGBTQ+ and Trans-Inclusive Sports**   
Proposer: Mia Clement (Oxford SU)   
Seconder: Aryemis Brown (Somerville)   
**Content Warning: Transphobia**

The motion addresses the exclusionary nature of university sports towards non-normative bodies, particularly trans individuals, due to differing governance practices among Oxford sports clubs governed by BUCS and non-BUCS. Citing experiences of trans students and academic literature like Phipps (2019) and Krech (2017), it elucidates the barriers posed by gender binary structures in sports. The motion stresses the importance of fostering an inclusive sports environment for all, aligning with Oxford's ethos of inclusivity. It advocates for accessible university and college clubs and the provision of 'Open Teams'. Resolutions include mandating the VP Activities & Community to work on an LGBTQ+ and trans-inclusive sports policy, collaborating with university and college clubs, the LGBTQ+ campaign, and working to improve both non-BUCS and BUCS club policies. Additionally, it seeks to initiate a dialogue with the university to ensure a legacy of communication regarding inclusivity in sports, promoting a sustainable change.

Q: Query on the extent of change achievable given BUCS operates across many universities.

A: Response reflected optimism that Oxford's influence could contribute to a successful and effective process.

Q: Inquiry regarding the safeguarding of Welfare provisions for trans students in alignment with this motion.

A: Affirmation of the importance of this consideration, with a commitment to keeping it in mind.

Q: Speculation on whether the motion is a reaction to any encountered resistance.

A: Clarification that there has been no resistance so far; the motion serves as insurance and assistance.

Q: Suggestion to amend the motion to include a working group for assistance with this matter.

A: Positive response to the suggestion of amendment.

Amendment:

For - (Overwhelming majority)

**Results:**

**Amended: LGBTQ+ and Trans-Inclusive Sports**

**Total votes = 46**

**Votes For = 39**

**Votes Against = 3**

**Abstentions = 4**

**MOTION DEEMED TO BE CARRIED**

4. **Creation of an Environmental Affairs Campaign for Social and Environmental Justice**   
Proposer: Mia Clement (Oxford SU)   
Seconder: Luca di Bona (St Hilda’s)

**Speech:** The motion underscores Oxford University's legacy of knowledge pursuit and global betterment, advocating for extending this legacy to social and environmental justice through an Environmental Affairs campaign. The proposed campaign aims to foster student engagement in dialogue, advocacy, and actions towards social and environmental justice. Key objectives include organizing educational events on environmental and ethical issues, engaging in advocacy with local and national organizations, fostering community engagement and networking, spearheading sustainability initiatives within the university, and ensuring transparency and accountability in ethical affairs. The campaign is perceived as a medium to empower students, enrich academic experiences, enhance the student union's ethical stance, and provide a platform for engagement and networking with individuals sharing similar ethical concerns. The motion resolves to create the Environmental Affairs campaign, with the campaign's constitution to be presented in the next Student Council meeting in the 7th week.

Q: Inquiry about managing potential funding crises for other campaigns given this proposal.

A: Mention of ring-fenced funds and exploring proactive methods for financial resources was discussed, emphasizing that substantial funds may not be crucial for this campaign's operation.

Comment: on the sizable budget surplus available for this initiative.

A: It was clarified that a minimum surplus is required for the Student Union, specifically for building up reserves, hence not all surplus funds are readily available for use.

Q: Query regarding the distinctiveness of social justice aspects in this campaign compared to others.

A: It was noted that the campaign will predominantly focus on environmental aspects of social justice, thus having a unique focus.

**Results:**

**Total votes: 34**

**Votes for: 33**

**Votes against: 1**

**Abstentions: 0**

**MOTION DEEMED TO BE CARRIED**

**5. Clarity on the Rules of Council**    
Proposer: Niall Pearson-Shaul, Merton   
Seconder: Joe Bell, Merton

Proposer details how. The rules were revised last year to facilitate smoother council operations. However, a subsequent decision by the trustee board has amended these rules, part of this reducing the number of council meetings from four to two times per term. An explanation of how the motion underscores the importance of adhering to established Student Council rules, which should not be altered arbitrarily or ultra vires, is given.

**Niall Peason-Shaul:**

* Expressed concerns over changes made to the council rules by the Trustee Board, describing them as being done ultra vires (beyond the powers).
* Mentioned that the changes make it harder to hold Sabbatical Trustees accountable.
* Stressed the importance of council input and criticized the lack of communication regarding the changes.
* Mentioned that the changes make reporting back to JCR quite a bit harder and compared comparison of the attendance at student council last term to this term as "like comparing apples to oranges."

**Joe Bell:**

* Expressed dissatisfaction with the abrupt and poorly drafted changes in council rules.
* Acknowledged the challenges faced by Sabbatical officers but expressed dissatisfaction with how the rules were changed without consultation.

**Nick Harris:**

* Mentioned that both the staff and Sabbatical officers were bordering on burnout, which was discussed at a trustee board away day.
* Indicated that a vote took place online to support the group as best as possible, aiming to invest more resources, pointing out the provision of pizza as an example.

**Mia Clement:**

* Described previous Student Council meetings as stressful and intimidating, and questioned the effectiveness of having four stressful meetings over two potentially more productive ones.
* Stressed the importance of looking after the wellbeing of the council members.
* Mentioned that the Trustee Board acts in the favor of what the SU is, ensuring its continuous running without the risk of falling in on itself.

**Shermar Pryce:**

* Disagreed with the assessment that the change was made completely unilaterally, stating that many, though unlikely all, JCR Presidents were informed.
* Agreed that communication about the change could’ve been done a lot better

**Gabriel(?):**

* Talked about the months of unpaid volunteer time that went into changing the rules initially through a working group and expressed dissatisfaction over how these efforts seemed to be disregarded with the recent abrupt changes.
* Mentioned that the rules were initially approved by the Trustee Board and had received input from them.

**Rosalie Chapman:**

* Talked about the workload associated with preparing for council meetings, mentioning that it takes about 20 hours of preparation from the staff which elicited laughter from the audience.
* Mentioned a drastic cut in staff from 37 to 17, while the same output of work was expected, emphasizing the need to reduce the number of meetings for manageability.
* Pointed out the low attendance at some meetings last year, with as few as seven people attending, to argue for the reduction of meetings.

**Theo Sergiou:**

* Agreed with the changes to the council but expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which the changes were made.
* Acknowledged the hard work of the trustees but desired a clear explanation as to why and how the change occurred, indicating a preference for more transparency and communication.

Further points of discussion:

* Inconsistencies were noted between the rationales provided for the changes (cost versus legal obligations) without further elaboration.
* Lack of clarity on official minutes from the trustee board concerning the changes was also brought up.
* Discussions emphasized the importance of consulting a broader range of stakeholders, not just those in JCR or MCR positions.
* Concerns about the ability to scrutinize actions and hold individuals accountable under the new rules were mentioned.
* Discussions also touched on how the changes affect the ability to report back to JCRs and the impact on the efficacy and productivity of the council.
* The hard work and volunteer time that went into the initial rule changes by a working group was highlighted, contrasting with the abrupt changes made by the trustee board.
* The importance of valuing volunteer efforts and fostering respectful dialogue regarding changes was also a point of discussion.
* The hard work of SU Sabbatical officers and staff was acknowledged and applauded.

**Amendment**

* An amendment was proposed to strike part 4 and amend part 1, to maintain the reduction of meetings to twice a term
* The vote count was recorded as 25 for the amendment, 0 against, and 1 abstention.

**Results:**

**Total votes = 48**

**Votes For = 33**

**Votes Against = 13**

**Abstentions = 2**

**This motion is deemed to be carried**

**I. Project Proposals for resolution**

**1. Science Policy Discussions**    
Proposers: Kai Sandbrink, LMH and Jirko Rubruck, St Cross

Mia (Speaker for the motion):Supports the motion and highlights the existing appetite for such discussions, mentioning the potential venues being the SU and/or LMH for hosting these events.

Q: Is there a timeline in place for events/speakers etc?

A: The enthusiasm already exists, and the events will be hosted either in the SU and/or LMH, although no specific timeline was provided.

**Results:**

**Total votes: 30**

**Votes for: 28**

**Votes against: 1**

**Abstentions: 1**

**MOTION DEEMED TO BE CARRIED**

**2. Ethical, Decentralised, Democratic Social Media**   
Proposer: Tom Campbell, Univ

Speech: Summarized the motion and elucidated on the benefits of adopting a decentralized social media model.

Q: Queries about the security measures and content on the proposed platform.

A: Tom responded that content moderation concerns would be alleviated through democratic systems to be implemented on the platform, aiding in maintaining a safe and respectful environment for users.

**Results:**

**Total votes: 28**

**Votes for: 22**

**Votes against: 3**

**Abstentions: 3**

**MOTION DEEMED TO BE CARRIED**

**J. Items for Discussion**

**1.** **Free Speech and the Oxford Union**    
Proposer: Luca di Bona, St Hildas

Title: Discussion on Union's Invited Speakers and Commitment to Free Speech

Discussion Points:

The discussion was initiated with concerns regarding the Oxford Union inviting individuals deemed morally reprehensible by the proposer. The proposer expressed a belief that the principle of freedom of speech doesn’t preclude the SU from condemning the Oxford Union for its choice of speakers.

The Oxford Union's statement was referenced, wherein a commitment to free speech was highlighted.

Discussion Contributions:

1. Mia: Expressed solidarity with the concerns raised.

2. Niall: Agreed with Mia and argued that while the Oxford Union claims to uphold free speech, it doesn't seem to hold speakers accountable. He clarified that the support for free speech should be to foster valuable discourse, not to provide a platform for bigots.

3. Jenni: Expressed a commitment to support and work with the proposer on this matter.

4. Univ MCR: Acknowledged limitations in what could be done but expressed a desire to see continued communication between the Union and SU.

5. Luca: Voiced that the discussions haven’t been constructive and brought up past instances where opposition to the Union was unjustly suppressed by security services and related organizations. Luca also highlighted precedents where the SU intervened to stop or condemn protests, indicating a need for a more balanced and constructive approach.