



*1st week Hilary 2003
Friday 24th January*

Welcome by the chair. The chair noted the amount of time the lecture room was available and explained that he may need to use guillotines and set time limits on speeches.

a. Minutes from the previous meeting

Not there, because the amendments are not added.

Georgia Toynbe, Balliol (GT) they will soon be there

Edd Southern, Somerville, (ES) who is the Returning Officer?

Will Straw New (WS) me

Visitor rights for Hollgar Willins requested by Mel Marshall were granted

c. Ratifications in Council

Target schools co chairs –

Hinesh Rajani, Merton (HR) pointed out that Rob Willans not Williams had been appointed.

OxStu editors – Natalie Toms, and Charles Hotham ratified

Ethics Committee: Charles Smith, St Anne's ratified

Finance and Funding– ratified

Environment committee – ratified

Acc affairs – no names

d. Elections in council -

University Council

ES how many positions?

WS one

WS explained what the positions were.

Sarojini McKenna, Trinity: explained the position. Other candidate a member of the exec, as are the two others representatives to the committee, so we should have someone who is not an exec officer. College rep not OUSU rep. JCR President of Trinity, so a good college representative. Role also to check that other position holders are doing the job right, she can.

John Blake, St. Hugh's: Would like to do it. Interesting. Happy to fill the role. Can do it, will do it. If Council feels that a college rep would be better, then vote for that. An ousu officer can tell what's going on.

Questions

Andrew Copson, Balliol (AC): – what are the direct benefits that you see from a college point of view?

JB don't know. Do you feel JCRs need representation. Students don't really speak, can't carry an agenda forward

SM if the role is to check the others are speaking OPUSU policy properly – then they should not be OUSU.

Mel Marshall clarified that SM was at Trinity and not St Hilda's as the ballot papers said.

Eleanor Thompson, Wadham: What experience do you have?

SM sit on governing body

JB was a Sixth form representative.

JCC Hust

WS outlined the post

SM – nothing to add

Questions

Daniel Rees, Merton (DR)– why do you want both?

SJ – no one else standing, someone to be a check and balance

JCC Hust

WS outlined the post

SM – nothing to add

Questions

Daniel Rees, Merton (DR)– why do you want both?

SJ – no one else standing, someone to be a check and balance

Voting began, and was counted as the rest of the meeting proceeded.

Results

Election for University Council Representative

SJ – 53

JB – 21

RON – 0

Election to JCC

SJ – 69

RON – 6.

e. Reports from Sabbatical Officers.

President

WS – not much to add. Wednesday Demo was very good, thanks to exec officers and co-chairs,. Going to be a great year for Finance and Funding. Am speaking in London on Monday, so if you want to come, contact me. 6:15 in Russell square with drinks afterwards.

Michael Girling, St. Edmund Hall: Is there an NUS briefing on Monday?

WS: yes, Oxford could take 22, at the moment 2 or three going, so if you are interested, come along. Monday afternoon in London

Rodrigo Davies – What do you think of the NUS sitting on a new access body

WS – don't know anything about it

Laura Santana St. Hilda's (LS) – In your report to Council you said that an article appeared in the BBC and then you spoke to them on line, and rectified the matter.

WS – I phoned them and said it was a misrepresentation of our views. No difference made clear between graduate tax and graduate repayment scheme. They put some of the old interview in. I and they were on holiday, and when at last I managed to get back to them an article went on line it says that students made their position clear that Will Straw has made it clear that students support education free at the point of entry.

Ros Dampier St Hilda's (RS) Has there been an article saying Oxford students don't support a graduate tax?

WS – yes.

VP Finance

Sean Sullivan (SS) – nothing to add

Tom Hart, Univ When will we get the living out guide?

SS – have arrived, accommodation office will send them

AC – Should have arrived at colleges on Monday.

Rachel Logan New (RL)– can the VP finances state that the financial loses will not affect move?

SS – won't, will give reserves to move not money from main account

James Lazou, Wadham – in OUSU shop, thought there was an advert for Bacardi. Don't we have policy against it?

SS – Well seen. Rotating advert thing. Stuck on Bacardi. May have been agreed before the motion to ban Bacardi, will look into it.

VP Welfare

AC Equal opportunities review has delayed report again – annoying. Report coming out in middle of term.

Disabilities team will be expanded by 1 person.

Ryan Mcghee (RM)– have there been any problems with collating the data for the college inequalities report you are involved in?

AC – yes, as I say in my report. If any JCR presidents here who would like to get back to us and uphold mandate, please do

VP Welfare

AC Equal opportunities review has delayed report again – annoying. Report coming out in middle of term. Disabilities team will be expanded by 1 person.

Ryan Mcghee (RM)– have there been any problems with collating the data for the college inequalities report you are involved in?

AC – yes, as I say in my report. If any JCR presidents here who would like to get back to us and uphold mandate, please do.

Penny Berrill, St. Hilda's– will you express disappointment about the advisory panel on disabilities?

AC – will meet after review.

VP Access and Academic Affairs

WS – not here, any questions I'll try to answer them.

There were no questions.

VP Women

MM NUS women's conference in 8th week for free. Please send someone.

There were no questions to this sabbatical officer.

VP Graduates

Andy Garlick Nothing to add

There were no questions to this sabbatical officer.

f. Reports from those Executive Officers who wish to make them.

Daniel Rees, Merton (DR) Speaking for previous exec for one world. Any one with any interests please email me.

HR Are there any plans to link up with other universities One World schemes?

DR No,

Point of information – already running a One World week in 1st week Trinity

RS – How many students were at the demonstration?

DR – 300, or actually, probably less.

GT Cracking on with portfolios, though not Pro Choice, because there are no co-chairs, can you please apply!

JB Access and Academic Affairs recently appointed a co-chair, but there is another co-chair needed so please apply.

Laura West, St Catz – OUSU reps will be meeting in 3rd week. There will be a social event. More ideas about this term.

Looking for another co-chair for OUSU reps. Need a co-chair for Ents.

RS – are you going to ensure the Ents events are accessible

Laura West Yes.

Helen McCabe – Diversity Week in 5th Week come. Holocaust Remembrance Day – come.

ES – Can we have a head count?

Exec - 9, and an apology.

Delegates – 9.

Chris Hanretty – have you all received web training and can we expect web updates soon.

SS – next week.

g. Emergency Motions.

1. Higher Education Funding

Short factual questions to the proposer of the motion.

ES – What is our policy on grants?

g. Emergency Motions.

I. Higher Education Funding

Short factual questions to the proposer of the motion.

ES – What is our policy on grants?

PB – I will check. I have just put in an amendment which may clarify this.

Nick Anstead, Mansfield – does this motion change OUSU policy?

PB – This motion is pointing out that we have something against the white paper and setting up a way of making a formal response. Nothing that says we oppose it as such, that will have to come after the formal response, which will be taken to JCRs.

RL – do we have policy about up-front fees and pay-later fees

PB – No, just generic fees

Chris Todd, Keble – Where was the figure of £21 thousand from?

PB – Charles Clarke.

Marilyn Thompson, Mansfield – does that include living costs?

PB – Those are estimated at 11 thousand over a three-year course.

Speech in proposition of the motion

PB – The White Paper is something which can be responded to immediately, so we should. Oppose differential fees, for example. Others aspects need more consideration, and so we need this motion. Thought it would sort out student hardship and university funding gaps – doesn't. Big deterrent on access work, and will undermine it for the future. Bad for welfare. Asking for an initial response, and then set up a more constructive framework to generate a formal response. Do it through Finance and Funding co-chairs so everyone can attend and contribute to report, so everyone can have a say. Way of making it an open and democratic response. Please support it.

Amendment: **In Council Resolves (6) replaces the word “disappointment” with “disgust”** Proposed RS;
Seconded Julia Buckley (Christ Church)

RS – it's all up there.

David Fellows, Oriel – seems a bit pointless.

Chair Does proposer accept?

PB – yes.

Amendment passed [unconstitutionally]

Friendly Amendment [unconstitutional]: Strike resolves 4

Friendly Amendment [unconstitutional]: Add to resolves 7 “and express our disappointment with the report on it's first reading”

Proposed PB; Seconded GT

Friendly Amendment [later debated]: Scrap council resolves 2.

Proposed RL; Seconded R. Wilkinson, St. Edmund. Hall

Amendment: **Add to Council Resolves 5 “but disappointed that it is contingent on parental income”**

Proposed GT; Seconded S. Wilkinson Somerville.

GT welcome introduction of grant but not a means tested one. Should signal disappointment that it is assessed on Parental income

PB – that was taken as read, perhaps more subtle.

Helena Puig Larrauri (HPL) St. Hilda's – seeing as the Govt has said it will only to be people under £10000 a year, then why should we support it

ES – why not make it explicit?

Vote: **Amendment passed**

Amendment: **Add to Council Resolves (7) “and also express our initial concerns about the impact on access that an increase in student debt and perceived debt will have.**

Proposed RS; Seconded Rosie Buckland, St. Hilda's (RB)

RS fair enough ask for clarification, but we should also express our disappointment about the increase (or perceived problem) of debt because it is a problem with access.

PB – amendment she has made has changed this by talking about other issues, which include access and academic affairs, not just finance and funding.

Vote: **Amendment passes**

Friendly Amendment [unconstitutional]: Add to resolves 3: oppose a gradual repayment scheme and graduation tax”

Proposed RS; Seconded Rosie Buckland, St. Hilda's (RB)

RS fair enough ask for clarification, but we should also express our disappointment about the increase (or perceived problem) of debt because it is a problem with access.

PB – amendment she has made has changed this by talking about other issues, which include access and academic affairs, not just finance and funding.

Vote: **Amendment passes**

Friendly Amendment [unconstitutional]: Add to resolves 3: oppose a gradual repayment scheme and graduation tax”

Proposed LS; Seconded Phil Thompson St. John's.

Amendment: **Add to Council Resolves (1) “and welcomes the removal of up-front tuition fees.”**

Proposed Tom Hart (TH) University; Seconded Charlie Pickles, University

TH - The crucial access issue is fees that are charged dependent on income. They have gone. It was a victory, so we should say thanks for getting rid of it.

RS – up front fees are not the only hindrance to access. Debt is. We shouldn't be thanking the Government for anything.

RL – loans still parental-income assessed. Shouldn't welcome this at all.

ES – new fees are nothing compared to old ones, an attack on students, we shouldn't thank the Govt for anything

DR – Government will listen more if we are not churlish.

WS – should pass it, we should welcome it to ensure that it never comes back.

LS – just another stunt to make it seem like they have done something for students by making it so that we pay up-front tuition fees after the degree.

WS – can't pay up front fees later

LS – not what I was saying, if you are going to pay fees later its pretty much similar to paying them up front

Duncan Cowan Gray, Worcester – someone has to pay. May as well be after degree. Economic point of view its better to pay afterwards, we should admit that to the Govt. Opposition all the way is not going to help.

ES – that would be the case since we don't support what they have brought in. We may have to say thank you for getting rid of tuition fees.

RL – won't care if it's before or after, still have to pay

Marcus Walker (MK) Oriel – surely she will accept that as fees are here, we should pay them back later when we earn something more than we do now.

PB – maybe original wording was wrong, glad they're gone because they should never have happened in the first place. It was still wrong to do it in the past.

Fiona Coady Hartford – are we accepting fees as here to stay? If we thank them then we may be accepting them altogether.

MTV

Support – arguments clear

Opposition (ES)

Passes.

Summation speech by the proposer of the amendment.

TH – welcoming no up front fees doesn't mean that we accept fees. Let's admit that we've achieved something.

RL – achieved nothing. Please don't welcome any of it.

Amendment passes.

Debate on the amended motion.

Chris Hanretty (CH) St. Anne's – when I first read it, I thought about voting for it, but now we are welcoming scrapping top-up fees, I can see it being misinterpreted in the press. Motion needs to be thought through again. Needs to be brought back when it makes sense

WS – majority people support amendment. Not inconsistent. Can support scrapping of up-front fees and not welcome graduate schemes. We have won something and we should be proud of that, or give up on being a student union

SS – can't not pass policy just because of the BBC, If we agree with it, vote for it. Bugger BBC online! If they can't read policy, that's their problem not mine

WS – move to a vote, have heard arguments.

LS – if whole nature of motion has changed then we should hear more than 2 points.

RS Move to a recorded vote

Speech in support of move to a recorded vote.

RS – people want to know how their reps voted

RM – slowing down Council time, we should just get on with it.

JB – can the Chair clarify the situation on people exercising an MCR vote if they are not a member of that MCR?

Chair – If the MCR president says they can, they can. I trust them.

JB – can we ask them to say they do?

Chair – if you want. But the procedural motion goes first

Procedural motion failed.

Vote on the amended motion

For – 45

Against – 34

Abstention – 4

Chair – if you want. But the procedural motion goes first

Chair – if you want. But the procedural motion goes first

Procedural motion failed.

Vote on the amended motion

For – 45

Against – 34

Abstention - 4

Motion passes.

The Chair received an official (written) request for a ruling

“Could the Chair clarify for Council please which colleges have sent notification from both common rooms to the effect that votes from one common room may be used by members of the other? JB”

The Chair reiterated that he trusted the members involved when they said they had their MCR President’s approval.

h. Passage of Motions Nem Com

m. 3 motion concerning OUSU’s relationship with RAG until June 2003

m. 9 motion concerning Diversity Week Plus.

m. 11 motion concerning Holocaust Memorial Day

m. 12 motion concerning Oxford Pride.

i. Motions of no confidence or censure

Speech by the proposer of the motion of censure

Phil Thompson (PT) St. Johns Can I ask that some copies of the article are sent round. (agreed) The letter written by President and President-elect, engages in intellectual debate with the Vice Chancellor which comes down on the side of the graduate tax, refuting his concerns. We should not be engaging in this debate, and we should not be backing a graduate tax. There is also a problem with lack of consultation, it is all very well to go within the spirit of OUSU policy, but this is not. I person in last Finance and Funding campaign meeting supported a graduate tax, 8 did not. No mandate for a co-chair to write a letter or to be more friendly about a graduate tax. There was time for consultation in term, yet none of the other two co-chairs, none of the two exec officers, no JCR Presidents and no finance and funding reps were consulted. The President elect’s JCR has policy against it, so they should have known about concerns. Timing also not good, there were no finalised details of the white paper, it was perhaps the most crucial month, and this letter went on the website, and was turned into a BBC article saying that Oxford favoured a graduate tax. There should have been an awareness that the letter might be pretty damaging to our campaign for free education.

Short Factual Questions to the proposer of the motion

DR – what is the purpose and consequence of a motion of censure?

PT – a motion of censure is intended to publicise how students have been represented by their sabbatical. Last one was for a fairly minor breach of policy, it is not a punishment last sabbatical a motion of no-confidence was passed against went on to do a full sabbatical term.

Paul Ashar St Hugh’s – can finance and funding formulate policy?

PT – Finance and funding is not autonomous, but when OUSU has no policy then finance and funding do it.

DR – does OUSU have policy on graduate tax?

PT – yes

GT – did the president elect write as president elect or co chair?

PT – co chair, but she wasn’t.

HPL – yes.

RL – does OUSU have policy about progressive taxation?

PT – yes

SS – did they state OUSU policy at end?

PT – yes, gave it a sentence

DR – does OUSU explicitly have policy against graduate tax or is it implicit?

PT – it is implicitly against a graduate tax.

RD – does OUSU have policy making a difference between up front fees and postponed fees?

PT – under motion just passed probably.

Torsten Henricson-Bell, (THB) Mansfield) point of information, top-up fees are not differentiated between up front and deferred.

PT – yes, gave it a sentence

DR – does OUSU explicitly have policy against graduate tax or is it implicit?

PT – it is implicitly against a graduate tax.

RD – does OUSU have policy making a difference between up front fees and postponed fees?

PT – under motion just passed probably.

Torsten Henricson-Bell, (THB) Mansfield) point of information, top-up fees are not differentiated between up front and deferred.

RL – Does OUSU policy explicitly say that we are opposed to fees

PT – yes

TH - Did the letter say we wanted fees?

PT – No.

AC – lets move to debate, some of the questions are have not got much of a point.

Debate

HPL – I believe in a non-means tested grant, and I believe that education should be free. The letter was a specific response to the Chancellor, which was a reply to a letter by Will, so we were in a debate. Our response did not say that it was good, but that it was a lesser evil than top-up fees. We tried to uphold OUSU Council policy. We wrote the letter in 9th week, when no one else was around, and I was about to leave. The other co-chairs let me write the letters within the term, so we thought it would still be OK. It might well have been better to let them see it. We were trying to make a case about what is best for students. We have got into a debate, with response by the Vice Chancellor, please read them to see if we were upholding OUSU policy.

SS – the fuss that has come about has surprised me. I read the letter, I read the letter before it and comments in the press, and as far as I can see both the President and President Elect have acted within OUSU policy. The press have misinterpreted it, that's not fault of OUSU officers. People are getting into trouble for getting into a debate for replying to the chancellor, and they were right to make the case to him that top up fees are worse than a graduate tax. We could ask them always to say "we believe in free education" then there would be no debate, and we would not win it. This letter clearly stated policy at the end, basically taken word for word from policy booklet. We have shown up Chancellor and have stated clearly what we believe. They are a credit to OUSU and not worthy of censure.

RL I am glad they engaged in debate. But I am bothered about what came out of it. The Vice Chancellor dismissed progressive taxation out of hand, but the better way of engaging in debate would have been to tackle him on this, which we have policy on, not something we don't have policy on. Please think carefully about OUSU main policy. We want to draw attention to our main policy

RD – The first time I came across it I was incensed. It seemed that the President and President Elect had gone against OUSU policy. Wrote to them, asking them what they were doing. They directed me to the letter, read it and feel that the article is the biggest misrepresentation I have ever seen. Makes a qualitative difference between top up fees and a graduate tax. Top up fees are worse than Grad tax, though neither of them are good. Pointing this out to Chancellor who had said that Graduate tax won't work, but top up fees will. So this was a perfectly valid letter. Could have led more strongly on policy, but don't need to censure them.

CH – It is not in the policy booklet that we can talk about a next-best option. I am not sure about engaging in debate with Chancellor. Says in policy booklet that education should be free for all, and graduate tax is not. They acted outside OUSU policy. Should ask officers to stick closely to censure motion

Paul Asher St Johns – I think there are two issues. If you think that in absence of policy and a strong feeling in finance and funding.

Point of Information THB – I attended them all, and there was no feeling in favour of grad tax

Paul Asher, St. John's if you don't think that the President acted outside OUSU policy and did not consult then vote for it.

Karim Palant New – a letter not a campaign. I would like to point out the last sentence. The letter is a response to an article.

RB– if we fail to censure are we allowing a dangerous precedent that consultation not needed. Censure only says, they messed up, so lets move on.

WS – I don't think I misrepresented OUSU policy. We could have done more to consult. It was a mistake, at the end of term.

Point of Information – The Vice-Chancellor's article was written 2 weeks before the end of term,

WS – The President Elect was running an election and then catching up on work. I was angry about the BBC article, and I phoned them up. There is a difference between graduate repayment and graduate tax. They still misrepresented it, so I sent them something else which is in my report. At the same time I, and Access and Academic Affairs, were writing a report to Charles Clarke, (who wishes us a happy new year) with a report confirming OUSU policy. If you want a campaigning student union then you've got to accept some mistakes.

Ali Richardson (AR), St. Edmund Hall move to vote

AR – We've heard the points

LS – this is very important and we should debate it more fully.

Passes

PB – move to a secret ballot because could be difficult for exec officers and those from the same college. Fear of intimidation

RM – council has not been intimidatory. Let's be accountable

Ali Richardson (AR), St. Edmund Hall move to vote
AR – We've heard the points
LS – this is very important and we should debate it more fully.

Passes

PB – move to a secret ballot because could be difficult for exec officers and those from the same college. Fear of intimidation

RM – council has not been intimidatory. Let's be accountable

Passes

Summation speeches

LS The president has conceded that mistakes have been made, so we should censure them I don't agree that a censure will lead to less campaigning. Don't think they wilfully wanted to destroy the campaign but it is grossly naive, and as a repercussion there have been misrepresentations in the press of the democratic belief of Council. So we should all move on with express policy.

HPL – There was no misrepresentation of OUSU policy. We have to discuss with The Vice-Chancellor about the white paper, and now can. White paper has a lot of things the University has to support, good to have a channel of discussion by which to do so. Don't think we damaged the campaign, don't think we should be censured.

Vote (by secret ballot, result announced at the end of the debate on the constitutional changes)

For 20

Against 70

Abstentions 4

Motion Fails

j. First Readings of Changes to the constitution

1. Council

Speech in proposition

WS – this is about trying to speed up Council time. Sensible. Not too controversial.

SFOs

CG – will additional board reps still be elected by council

WS – don't get elected here anyway. (after a point of information).

PB - when and why was the RON option added?

WS – any OUSU experts?

MM – been there for ever

RS – if there is a RON option then it is hardly unopposed.

Amendment: Change Council resolves 1(a) “or if one voting member of Council” to “or if one OUSU member”.

Speech in opposition to the motion

PB I have a problem with a husting in council where person is unopposed. So what when a very unsuitable person standing Council should be able to hear and make that decision. Positions don't come up very often, taking it to OUSU exec takes the opportunity to hust away from people. Should hear about the people who will represent us

WS – important to hear people hust, so that's why we've put in if any one wants them to, then we will hear them. It's a way of making things more efficient.

RS– Husts don't take up very long. As there is opposition, then people will email and ask for it.

AC – that's the point of the motion. People can ask if they want.

PB – worried about democracy being seen as time wasting. people have stood for positions and have then been unsuitable.

John Townsend, Univ move to a vote

Speech in proposition for moving to a vote.

JT points have been made

GT – there's something I'd like to amend.

Fails

ES - I like democracy, but when people are husting, people don't really pay much attention. But in Exec we really have a hard think. More democratic, not being elected without an interview.

Eleanor Thompson, Wadham – amendment – candidates will not be made accountable. Need to hust.

Andy Garlick, Christ Church: Opposition to the Amendment – Let's take the motion in parts. 2 different issues.

Eleanor – Amendment now superfluous. Withdrawn.

Chair – lets take part 1 first.

More points of debate on the 1st part of the motion.

ES - I like democracy, but when people are husting, people don't really pay much attention. But in Exec we really have a hard think. More democratic, not being elected without an interview.

Eleanor Thompson, Wadham – amendment – candidates will not be made accountable. Need to hust.

Andy Garlick, Christ Church: Opposition to the Amendment – Let's take the motion in parts. 2 different issues.

Eleanor – Amendment now superfluous. Withdrawn.

Chair – lets take part 1 first.

More points of debate on the 1st part of the motion.

Ed Watkins Keble – it will sometimes be the case where we know we could trust someone to do it, and a hust would be a waste of time.

SS Move to a vote

SS a simple thing.

Georgia: more things to say.

Passes

Summation speeches on 1st Part

WS – we brought it to see, vote how you want.

PB – dangerous precedent. RON is there for a reason.

Vote

For 50

Against 25

Abstentions 0 –

Part one passes.

Part two of the motion

Move to a vote.

Part two passes.

2. Delegates

Friendly amendment: Change “Common Rooms” to “Constituent Organisations”.

Proposed AR; Seconded Oliver Petter St Edmund Hall

Friendly Amendment: To add to schedule 3 (Job Descriptions) a new section “Delegates” and insert “delegates are required...”

Speech in Proposition

AR – don't think that current situation is entirely satisfactory. A proposal to ensure that delegates remain accountable and accessible. Open up debate on delegates and whether people are happy about it or not. I have been persuaded that delegates are a good thing, but I think that they should be more accountable. Yes, they put forward a manifesto but they should still be accessible and accountable.

SFOs

Paul Asher – who are the constituents? Is this just a Teddy Hall thing?

AR – no, don't know if we would want them turn up. Constituent organisations are student unions and common rooms

Peter Morton Somerville – if delegates perform no function how are they an important cross-accountable representation?

AR – hmmm. Amend it.

CH – does requirement include own common room. What standing order provision is there for delegates?”

AR – yes, none.

Rebecca Wilkinson, Teddy Hall – when I was a delegate we were asked to go to a JCR and ask some questions, was that report made and is it readable?

AR – I don't know, I suppose so

Michael Girling, Teddy Hall – who will enforce it?: How will it be enforced?

AR – Council.

ES– is the constituent organisations for delegates JCRs and Student Unions

AR – yes

Dominic Curran, St Hugh's – how many common rooms etc are affiliated?

WS– all but three so 68.

AR – wouldn't visit every one every term.

Move to debate

ES– is the constituent organisations for delegates JCRs and Student Unions
AR – yes

Dominic Curran, St Hugh's – how many common rooms etc are affiliated?

WS– all but three so 68.

AR – wouldn't visit every one every term.

Move to debate.

Points for debate.

Paul Asher – given the article in last terms newspapers, about Ali et al wanting to abolish delegates altogether, is there any hidden agenda? It is a poorly worded motion, there are so many amendments needed to make it consistent, why not just withdraw it and rethink it?

AC – Not very clear, especially if I have convinced you. Delegates are elected on manifestos, so their representative nature is captured at their moments of election. They gain nothing from JCRs etc. this motion betrays a misunderstanding about cross-campus accountability and representation. Faffing around with them makes no sense. Them going to common rooms will not change anything.

MM – what are the implications? 1), they do have a function. 2), they know what people think and are not recluses. 3) if they go to common rooms (notwithstanding the technical problems) and listen then they become another vote for that common room, if they don't why did they go in the first place?

Friendly Amendment: to add “and shall attend at least 3 OUSU Councils per term”

AC is the amendment not rather disingenuous?

Chair –motion says that have no function, so amendment is appropriate. Internal inconsistencies are for council not chair.

AR Move to a vote Heard it all.

Karim Palant New – The last amendment has changed emphasis of motion, introducing accountability of delegates and no to doing their jobs so motion now tries to do two things.

Passes

Summation speeches

AR– I still think it is good, now means that delegates have a set job description

MM – changes the function of delegates and it is extra votes for JCRs, cumbersome to enforce, and does not understand the point of delegates.

Motion Fails.

3. Oxford Student

Speech in proposition for the motion

Joseph Mcauly Christ Church (JM) I was editor of the OxStu, and if it were to go through I would sit on a committee that looks into the OxStu. Now appointed by the sabs which doesn't make any sense. Would make more sense to have the proposed committee.

SFQs

Pete Morton – use of English. Is this a copy of the motion which was rejected in Micahelmas 2002?

JM yes

SS – what would the financial position of the committee?

JM – amendment to say,

RL – What were you asked about equal opportunities in your interview?

JM – I was asked whether I would do more about Grads and ethnic minorities and other minorities which are not to do with a student newspaper.

Michael Girling (MG) Teddy Hall – the committee will meet four times a term to discuss the OxStu.

JM yes

RL – is it true that the OxStu lost OUSU 18 000 pounds last year.

JM – yes.

ES – who is legally liable for the paper?

JM – VP finance

SS – would there be a situation where the editors would form a majority?

JM – could be, but they would have no financial control

Jamie Johnson, Somerville – are there any guidelines about what the current pubs board can ask?

JM – don't know.

ES – who is legally liable for the paper?
JM – VP finance

SS – would there be a situation where the editors would form a majority?
JM – could be, but they would have no financial control

Jamie Johnson, Somerville – are there any guidelines about what the current pubs board can ask?
JM – don't know.

Move to debate

Friendly amendment: Change all references to “management committee” to “consultative committee”

Remove the word “all” in Resolves 4

Insert into Resolves 4 “The Consultative Committee of the OX. Stu, shall be a discursive body and shall meet fortnightly...”

To insert at the end of Resolves 4 “and they shall not have the power to make binding financial decisions.”

Proposed JM; Seconded RD

Points of debate on the motion

SS– as VP finance, I am responsible for publishing it. It is editorially independent, which is blatantly obvious. Formation of Management Committee would manage newspaper which should be the responsibility of OUSU. We give it money, so we need to be the sole people with a say over the management of the newspaper. I am accountable, and I do it at the moment. A management Committee might have a good change of being ex-editors, and they are not accountable. Solution to the perceived problems would be an editorial committee not this management committee.

The Chair mentioned that these speeches would have to be kept short as he had ruled at the beginning of the debate. SS expressed concern about shortness of time given for speech.

SS OUSU has never exerted influence over editorial selection who would have to be “loyal” to OUSU. Much worse is ex-editors appoint, it will end in cliqueness. Newspaper has to stay within OUSU control, with someone to hold to account

RL – I have sat on frequent pubs boards. We are not trying to force an OUSU agenda onto an editor. It has been a very objective forum. Concern of nepotism of ex editors.

Move to a vote

GT – lots to do, have heard both for and against
Charles – not heard all there is to say.

Passes

Summation speeches

JM– see from amendment will be a consultative committee with no financial input. Make sure no nepotism from OUSU, Editors appointed on journalistic ability.

MM– Sean has made a very pertinent point that OUSU money is spent on newspaper, so OUSU elected people should be responsible for making sure that it is spent correctly.

Motion fails.

m. Other motions

1. Electoral Regulations Hilary Term 2003

Proposition speech

WS – two bi-elections this term so get in touch if you want to run. Election regulations are identical to ones passed in Michaelmas except for Section H on ballot boxes, so don't want to have to insist on every college having a ballot box. Part on JMB to fit with new-size newspaper.

SFOs

GT – how long will these last?
WS – until next election

Joe Taylor – will you ensure that colleges a long way away from others will be represented.
WS – Hope colleges will have, if really don't want it will be able to pair up.

RS – will you insist on JCR mandate or will you rely on JCR president saying they don't want one?
WS – will contact College RO.

Louise Radnofsky Univ (LR)– how many colleges did not have ballot boxes last time?
WS – only the PPHs

AG will you ensure that Nuffield gets a box?

RS – will you insist on JCR mandate or will you rely on JCR president saying they don't want one?
WS – will contact College RO.

Louise Radnofsky Univ (LR)– how many colleges did not have ballot boxes last time?
WS – only the PPHs

AG will you ensure that Nuffield gets a box?
WS – absolutely.

Debate

Laura West – worried about not having a ballot box and not having complete JCR mandate

MM can't dictate how colleges decide. We can't guarantee that an election in a college who didn't want a box that will be free and fair if no one will watch it. It is better on balance to give you a properly scrutineered box.

RS – thought we took something out last time.

WS – let's amend it. If anyone can remember.

Amendment: to f.3.iii: change to "forms and holds policies of a political nature"; to f.3.ii: strike "or proposing to endorse"

Proposed WS; Seconded RS

Passes

Vote on the amended motion

Motion passes

2. Student Advice Service

Proposition Speech

AC – This is the update on the student advice service at the end of Michaelmas term. We're very pleased with it.

Changes made by my predecessor were good. Want to be mandated to go away and think about further things. Think that should be a permanent advise officer

Short Factual Questions

Paul Asher (SJC) - what are the categories on the left?

AC the number of people who have come to us.

JT – how does this compare with JCR welfare services

AC – I don't know. Not had very much information back from JCRs. Bit of a mammoth task.

Hinesh Rajani (Merton)– how much did it cost?

SS – comes from a number of parts of the budget. Chair gives Hinesh a booklet so he could find out for himself

Phil Thompson (SJC) what period do the figures cover?

AC student advise office covers term time, but our figures cover from end of July to end of Michaelmas.

MM – can you confirm that the VP (Women) is very happy to receive emails and has just not given you the figures?

AC – yes, yes

Motion passes.

4. NUS Report

Proposition speech

Edd Southern Somerville – ask me some questions. I am basically saying that we should have a new system between Oxford and the NUS not quite centralised, but more centralised than before in certain areas.

SEQs:

Jonty O-C Magdalene – a notion of paying less to NUS – who do I go and see?

ES – when we get a committee we'll get it sorted. Until then, talk to Matt Richardson

Andrew Christ Church – will the report mean that non-NUS affiliated colleges will pay for NUS stuff to be processed by OPUSU out of their contributions?

ES – yes.

WS – actually, no additional cost

David Follows (Oriol) – if you want to be in NUS and not OUSU can they still do that?

ES – matter for college.

AC – what additional burdens would this make on colleges?

Andrew Christ Church – will the report mean that non-NUS affiliated colleges will pay for NUS stuff to be processed by OPUSU out of their contributions?

ES – yes.

WS – actually, no additional cost

David Follows (Oriol) – if you want to be in NUS and not OUSU can they still do that?

ES – matter for college.

AC – what additional burdens would this make on sabs?

ES – don't think they are additional burdens. Will have to look at organisation of some campaigns, but probably not make much of a difference because do that anyway.

Penny Berrill, St Hilda's – will be some Constitutional amendments, so what, quite, does implementing the findings mean?

ES – meant that we should formulate some kind of mechanism proposals, not that from now on the plan happens. This is a plan about having a plan.

AC – Do you see the implementation of the report that committees have to support NUS campaigns?

ES – gives a moral responsibility but not a political one. A matter for the campaigns. Not asking them to do something they don't want to do.

Paul Afshar, SJC – what other benefit do we get from NUS other from the cards

ES – read the report. I'm not here to defend the NUS.

No opposition

Motion passes

5. Term Planner

Speech of proposition

SS – towards the end of last term I sought quotes for the OUSU term planner, which we have to produce under the constitution. Quotes were expensive. Not getting enough advertising revenue. Decided not to produce it. I now have to bring a motion to tell you. But if you don't agree there will be no point in doing it for the term because it is too late. What I will do in the future is to look again and have another try. I will inform council whether I have found a quote.

SFOs

PT – how much did it make last term?

SS – about £150. When we consider the amount of time that goes in to distributing then we made no profit.

Laura West – how about doing an internet form of the planner?

SS – yes. Once we have the software, we will set it up.

Penny Berrill – have you not thought about doing something like a centre spread in the paper?

SS – Term planner has two points – one to provide something you can use and about events. Second it was to make a lot of advertising money, which we are no longer doing it. Willing to look at other forms, but this is about not doing it like this this term.

Debate

Ros Dampier – need to discuss this a bit more. Only place where many students see the contact details for the Student Advice Service.

Move to a vote

DR – only one opposition to the motion

RD – may as well have the debate

Passes

Summation speeches

SS – I know its an important publication, which is why I will come back to Council. No point producing things at a loss. Can't do it for this term anyway.

RS – disgusting that one of the only publications with the contacts on will disappear, Only thing people get from OUSU. Could lead to disaffiliation.

For 40,

Against 20,

Abstentions 4

Motion passes

For 40,
Against 20,
Abstentions 4

Motion passes

6. Mature Students

Speech in proposition

AG – Explained campaign. Are about 2004 matures students in the university, quite a sizable part of the University. It was met on Tuesday and was well supported. Want Council's approval to agree that we get it going again, and which the co-chairs can do and bring back to Council.

SFOs

MG– have said that Mature students have not been very involved in political scene?

AG – had a turnout of 13 which is not bad. Mature students feel isolated and are very supportive about any OUSU move to support their welfare.

Motion passes

7. RAG

Speech in proposition

JOC – explained motion. Will build a strong foundation for the merger.

SFOs

Jo Taylor – what is the market value of such a page?

JOC - £40.

Speaker rights proposed and accepted for Business manager

Kat Wheatley – quite a bit more than £40.

Debate

GT – OxStu has charity rates. Already makes big losses?

WS – Shouldn't have people asking for free space all the time. But RAG will soon join OUSU

MM – can't just keep giving to people willy-nilly

Tom Hart, – let's set the precedent of giving money to organisations that are about to join OUSU.

Andrew Warner Christ Church- what about motion 3?

AC – quite right about the previous motion. Even OUSU doesn't get free advertising in OxStu.

JOC – was a free advert in OxStu was given to someone else.

Move to a vote

For 33

Against 21,

Abstentions 4 -

Motion passes

8. OUSU Banner

Speech in proposition

WS – self explanatory

Short Factual Questions

HR Merton – how much?

WS – less than £100.

- Who is non-OUSU?

WS means you have to have Council support if you are not an OUSU committee

PT – wasn't there a motion last term?

WS – it was withdrawn, so I have brought it to get approval and to set guidelines.

MG can you confirm that if it is not available by February 15th we can have something?

WS – yes.

Edd Southerden, Somerville – why the deposit?

PT – wasn't there a motion last term?

WS – it was withdrawn, so I have brought it to get approval and to set guidelines.

MG – can you confirm that if it is not available by February 15th we can have something?

WS – yes.

Edd Southerden, Somerville – why the deposit?

WS – because the last one was lost, (as is the grants not fees) so we want to try and get something back if it is.

RS – it's at Exec discretion. What about direct action supported by OUSU policy which is supported by OUSU?

WS – we could always just email round the exec and see if there was any opposition

HR Merton – who gets it if more than 1?

WS – 1st come 1st served.

Motion passes

10. Institute of Legal Practice

Speech in proposition

SS – towards the middle of last term I was contacted by the institute of legal practice (a law school in Oxford by effect). Have around 300 students studying the solicitors' qualification. In their constitution and on lists of OUSU they have appeared as associated members of OUSU. Oxford Brookes have said what this means, Want to be able to negotiate what associate membership means. Can't stand, can't vote (not matriculated). Should get facilities (for a payment). Now sell them publications and tickets for freshers' fairs. Ensure that their student union could meet with the sabs. And could come and speak here, but not vote.

SFOs

PT – what kind of area will the membership be in?

SS – Freshers Guide, Oxford Handbook, allow them to use the night-bus etc. At an appropriate rate.

Jamie Johnson Somerville – how do these compare with other associate members? How do they compare with relationship with Brookes?

SS - Brookes has a stronger relationship. As for others there is only really something in Wellington square (about continuous education) that we are close to, as well as Ruskin.

PT – do we now sell publications individually? So will we make less money?

SS – no, because now buy a small number will buy more. It's very unsatisfactory

HRM – why only two reps and not three?

SS – allows President and a friend so not lonely. No need for any more. Slightly overcrowded.

Motion passes.

12. Higher Education

Friendly Amendment: In all cases, replace “the” with “a” so that Council Further Believes 1) reads

“That this aim to see 50% of school leavers into some form of higher education is a cause of the financial crisis facing Britain's universities.”

Make amendment in “Council Further Believes” and “Council Resolves”

Resolves now reads “To mandate the President to write to the Government to express OUSU's dissatisfaction with the aim of seeing 50% of school leavers into higher education as this is a cause of the funding crisis facing universities within the UK, and the reason why top-up fees are being introduced.”

Proposed: John Townsend Univ

Speech in proposition of the amended motion

JT – Want you to think about the reason why there is a funding crises. Funding has stayed the same but there are now more universities. Degrees from universities are wilfully cruel. These degrees from new universities are not a sound investment. Wide basis of support. Want to make sure that OUSU's policy is consistent and sensible.

Short factual questions

DR – why is it necessary to say that 50% is a cause and at the root of the funding crisis?

JT – because they are increasing students without increasing funding.

Paul Afshar, SJC – are you aware that we are not forced to get into debt?

JT Want you to think about the reason why there is a funding crisis. Funding has stayed the same but there are now more universities. Degrees from universities are wilfully cruel. These degrees from new universities are not a sound investment. Wide basis of support. Want to make sure that OUSU's policy is consistent and sensible.

Short factual questions

DR – why is it necessary to say that 50% is a cause and at the root of the funding crisis?

JT – because they are increasing students without increasing funding.

Paul Afshar, SJC – are you aware that we are not forced to get into debt?

JT – can't deny that most students get into debt.

Laura McInerney St, Peter's – can you define poorer quality degrees?

JT – unlikely to get the kind of job needed to repay debt.

Jamie Johnston – is the amendment correct?

Chair – no, it's express.

Tom Goodhead Magdalen – is it true that Britain already has one of the highest graduate rates in the world?

JT – yes.

Karim Palant, New – is he aware about the difference between HE and University? Is he also aware to a lack of funding per student which fell by 36% between 1979 and 1997 which was before the access target was thought of?

JT – the issue is not about money but about the number of institutions. This is why we have the current problems of today.

Move to debate.

Points of Debate on the motion

MM - statement from the Access and Academic Affairs: Firstly, we all (I hope) agree that widening access to Oxford and higher education in general is a good thing. I believe that increasing access cannot take place without expanding the numbers that go into higher education. This is because widening participation is all about encouraging people from non traditional backgrounds to apply, and this isn't accompanied by discouraging less able people from the middle and upper socio economic groups from applying. It would be very difficult to see increased access to HE if numbers don't rise. So whether or not we agree with the government's numerical target, voting against this motion would send out completely the wrong message. Secondly, many of the motion's premises are, quite simply, false. It is not the government's 50% target is 'the root of the funding crisis'. It is the government's refusal to put more money in HE which is the problem.

Voting for this motion would condone the levels of government funding in HE today, which I believe are far too low. Thirdly, please consider the signal we would send out if this motion becomes OUSU policy. Whether we agree with the detail of the government's policy or not, it is dangerous for us as a student union to have policy against increasing the number of places in HE. We already know that the media have their own agenda - you only need to look at what happened with the BBC reporting on our views on a graduate tax to realise that. I am extremely concerned that if we have the above policy we will be very vulnerable to reports from the media of Oxford students being elitist; it doesn't matter how carefully Will phrases the letter or a press release about the motion, I am sure that this policy would give fuel to government figures (and we all know who they are) who like to portray Oxford as an elitist, backward institution. I'm sorry if this sounds pragmatic, but even if you agree with the motion this is something you must consider before voting for it. I believe that if this motion passes it could jeopardise the excellent work that OUSU and many others in this university carry out for widening access.

David Follows, Oriel – it is inconsistent to have sensible policy on top up fees etc. without having policy against increasing the number of places. On access, widening access does not mean just having more. Shouldn't take places for people who are not clever enough.

THB – Middle class already see university as a right, so you are threatening WC people from coming if we do not increase the number of people coming.

Laura Santana St. Hilda's- I think this is ridiculous. It is fundamentally flawed. It is in line with policy to believe in free education so we should welcome an increase in people getting involved in education. It is not a cause of lowering standards, that is the fault of the Govt and it's declining to put in more money. It would make us look like an elitist council. Council I believes not very affective.

WS – Don't agree with Govt policy but we can't make it look like we oppose increased access, and I am very clear that we should increase. Charles Clarke has already abandoned the 50%, only towards 50%.

More to vote – its irrelevant and we're not going to agree

lots more to say

passes

Summation speeches

JT – looking at what CC has said, then if they have abandoned it then we need to put it in OUSU policy. This represents some deep divisions in the debate about people who look at it sensibly or not. If you get people who should not go to university into debt they may never pay it off. You represent the most astute and intelligent students in the country so have conviction in your convictions.

GT – its bad for students to have debt. It is bad if students have different level of HE service. This is a pessimistic motion. Free education is a good thing for everyone, whether or not we get a job. This motion is bad for access. The cause is Government under-funding, not people going to University. Lets just scrap fees, put in more money and get on with it.

Motion fails.

J1 – looking at what CC has said, then if they have abandoned it then we need to put it in OUSU policy. This represents some deep divisions in the debate about people who look at it sensibly or not. If you get people who should not go to university into debt they may never pay it off. You represent the most astute and intelligent students in the country so have conviction in your convictions.

GT – its bad for students to have debt. It is bad if students have different level of HE service. This is a pessimistic motion. Free education is a good thing for everyone, whether or not we get a job. This motion is bad for access. The cause is Government under-funding, not people going to University. Lets just scrap fees, put in more money and get on with it.

Motion fails.

n. Any Other Business

AC, Balliol – Giving out Holocaust Memorial day posters

James Lazou, Waddham - as we are opposed to the war, we are going to the RAF at 11 – come, and come on the march on the 15th. Party for Peace tomorrow

WS, New – new guides to OUSU so take one. Also, take your rubbish or chuck it in a black bag.

THB – bring a shirt, and come to the meeting about not having the shirt taken off your back.

David Follows, Oriel – recycle the rest of your rubbish.

Matt Richardson St. Peters – will be an NUS meeting in St Peters at 5 on Thursday. Come.

John Blake, St Hugh's - can I have an emailed ruling on MCR votes?

Chair They have to satisfy me. They have.

Chair – I am having a meeting about Council reform. 10 – 12 in New lecture room 6 on Tuesday. Come.

Here endeth the minutes of 1st Week OUSU Council.

15