



Apologies were received from Alex Waksman (delegate).

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

There were no matters arising.

Ratifications in Council

There were no ratifications.

Elections in Council

There were two elections for Council:

Rules Committee

Elliott Goldend (Pembroke)

OUSU Complaints Committee

Matt Holehouse (Queen's)

Jack Matthews (St Peter's)

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

John Maher (Keble)

Elliott Goldend (Pembroke)

Alistair Wrench (St Hugh's)

Rich Hardiman: should complaints committee follow the spirit or letter of the law?

Elliot letter should win

Matt spirit

John spirit

Alistair spirit

Paul spirit

Jack both

All candidates were elected in both elections.

Reports from Executive

Martin McCluskey clarified the Cherwell article on the College Contributions fund – he is supportive
Emphasised VC, SRI and Reach Oxford.

VP Finance situation – Head of General Office progress with University Finance Office – job should

be advertised in the next three weeks.

Rich Hardiman talked about the new Weds OFS night.
Living Out Guides – get back to Rich with numbers asap.

Louise Randall reminded everyone to drink sensibly.

Ingrid Frater emphasised contacting mature students about the new campaign.

James Lamming talked about Target Schools.

Claire Addison reminded everyone about the Alternative Careers Fair next Saturday.

Part time exec members all introduced themselves.

Questions to Exec

Elliott Goldend (Pembroke): What's happening about the extra NUS delegate?
Martin: We will need a cross-campus ballot

Paul Dwyer: What's the deadline for HOGO?
Martin: will need to look at who applies, cut-off date not necessary yet.

Alistair Wrench: what if only unsuitable candidates apply?
Martin: will not appoint anyone who is unsuitable

Emergency Motions

There were none.

Hannah Roe asked for a procedural motion to have the motion of censure not put to Council.

Chair: to delay requires a 2 thirds vote in favour

Speech in favour (Hannah Roe): doesn't want this motion to be discussed here and now. There is an ongoing complaints procedure, they should decide from that. Council should hear from that procedure.

Speech against (Rich Hardiman): there is a complaints committee to decide on the complaint, but that will be deciding how to stop things happening again. Not how to 'punish' the sabbatical officer.

Rachel Cummings (Sommerville): what's the complaints committee doing?
Chair: this is not a procedural question, so cannot be answered at this point.

Procedural motion failed by a clear majority.

Passage of motions nem com

The Holocaust Memorial Day motion passed nem com.

Motions of No Confidence or Censure

Martin McCluskey proposed the motion. This is the only way we can hold people to account. Complaints committee not to decide how to 'punish' an officer. This is the way that we publicly hold officers to account. A confidential meeting was used in a statement. We cannot have a situation where any officer thinks they can leave and go tell someone else about something said in a confidential meeting.

Hannah Roe gave a speech in opposition. The complaints board has to give a report. This is sensitive and involves information, should be held in complaints board with sufficient time. Anything can be brought to the next Council.

Jonny Medland (Queens): are there important details not in the motion? what are they?

Martin: this deals with one of a broader range of points. This is a clear cut case of someone breaking regulations. Clear cut and Council to decide.

Elliott Goldend (Pembroke): when do we expect an answer from complaints committee?

Martin: asap, hopefully by next meeting

Stefan Baskerville (Univ): are there any grounds for breaking confidentiality?

Martin: appts board, like any other job application, is confidential. Not to be discussed outside. No grounds for breaking confidentiality.

Hannah Roe: people elected for complaints now in Council?

Martin: yes

Jo Edwards (Jesus): do other details include the same member of staff or others?

Rich: can't answer this – it's confidential.

Alistair Wrench (St Hugh's): are the other instances to be put to complaints committee?

Martin: everything will be.

Marlene Cayoun (LMH): details too sensitive for Council to know about?

Rich: in good faith, this should be confidential, it wasn't confidential – a rule has been broken.

Ben Karlin (New): precedent for this sort of thing?

Martin: no motion of censure against sabbatical officer under current constitution, we don't think. But this is standard practice elsewhere.

Marlene Cayoun (LMH): was Hannah in the capacity of VP Women at the meeting?

Martin: we all attend as VPs

Hannah Roe: who else is allowed to attend appts board?

Martin: exec, and previous editors of OxStu

Leonora Sagan (Wadham): have any of these points been denied by the VP Women?

Martin: leave for debate

Katherine Wall (LMH) others held to confidence?

Martin: yes, all

Debate

Rich Hardiman: Hannah's speech in opposition covered procedure. This is clear cut. A series of things being discussed by complains committee. This is a clear breach. Horrible situation to be in. Student Union that we all want has to abide by a certain set of pre-defined rules. You have to agree to uphold those. If not, you have to be held accountable. If we don't pass this, it'll make accountability a joke – this would be a great shame.

Joe Ammoun (SEH): does the VP Women believe that she has broken confidentiality?

Hannah: not appropriate to talk here. Think I should be held accountable, but there's a procedure for this.

Stefan Baskerville (Univ): this is why motions of censure do exist. This is appropriate. It was in a written testimony. You wrote it. There is nothing to debate.

Daniel Lowe (SEH): we could at least postpone till we have the complaints committee. Procedural motion to delay motion. There is more that can be added, this would be more fair.

Paul Dwyer: opposition is that we don't need more information. It's up to us to decide.

Procedural motions failed.

Move to vote passed.

Move for secret ballot proposed by Martin McCluskey.

Rich Hardiman opposed: this should be public, we should be holding someone to account.

Martin: outcome more than the process.

Move for a secret ballot failed.

Martin Speech in proposition: facts all there.

Hannah: there are sensitive things to say, would appreciate people abstaining.

65 votes for
3 votes against
11 abstentions

Motion of Censure passed.

Other Motions

Protecting OUSU members

James Lamming gave a speech in proposition. Motion to cancel referendum and insert a new wording to the policy. We have a no platform policy. Last summer, Nick Griffin was offered an interview on Oxide Radio and Alan Strickland forbade it, but he had no power to do so. BNP views are still legal. Council voted in favour of a platform policy. Last term it reared its head with the Oxford Union. OUSU should have a mechanism to say that if you wish to break the law, OUSU isn't going to help you. People never looked at the No Platform policy. It doesn't say anything about free speech. The issue never existed in the first place, and we are having a referendum on something that was never an issue. Referendums are important and a good thing. But there are other mechanisms as well – such as Council. A referendum would be a mistake. We don't want our resources to help people break the

law. The time and money to be spent on a referendum would be a waste. Not about speech, about helping people to break the law. Need to use this sort of passion in such an issue, but use in issues like access.

Lewis Iwu (New): how many colleges last term asked OUSU for a referendum?

Martin: 10 for Michaelmas, but they were too late.

Joe Ammoun (SEH): is there a pre-emptive nature of this?

James: prevention better than cure.

Dani Quinn (Merton): how many colleges failed motions for referendum? can we postpone this motion – is there an imperative to do it now?

James: not sure. would be good to do this today, but if there is a strong feeling to take this back to Crs then fine.

James (St John's): monetary cost of referendum?

James: JMB physical cost. Time spent by sabs you pay. Publicity. And your own resources. £400 minimum.

Adam Smith (Balliol): why did it take you till now if you read it in December?

James: January. Apologise for delay

Aidan Simpson (Sommerville): clarify policy

Jonny Medland: everything left up to Council. Council will always have the final decision.

Joe Ammoun (SEH): this must be a set of rules rather than guidelines?

James: importance is so that exec can act in an emergency. Council will always have power.

Joe: Would someone because of their views be stopped from standing for an election, or would they have to show that they have incited violence etc?

James: if exec finds it to be the case and Council agrees, then that's

Marias (Worcester): what about Oxide and OxStu?

James: they are editorially independent.

Jonny: can this be postponed?

Martin: you could suspend referendum in this motion. That would give us third week Council.

Lewis Iwu: are there any other referendums planned for this term?

Martin: no

Daniel Lowe: what is the current policy as it stands?

James: read it

Leonora Sagan (Wadham): by a simple majority Council could overrule exec? Would that not be illegal if there's a question of interpretation.

Jonny: if exec says no, and Council says yes, then RO is a safeguard.

Hannah Roe: what's different between this and the law?

James: this is a point to debate.

Daniel Lowe: what would the procedure be for someone not on exec to speak up?

James: could bring to exec or Council

Katherine Wall: what would this be called?

James: NUS delegation

Laith (Magdalen): how does this differ from the law?

James: not an expert, so not sure.

Speech in opposition John Maher

Spoke at the start of his term. 10 CRs did pass motions. By the letter of the law, Martin is right re referendum. But 10 JCRs wanted a referendum. Students don't always care about OUSU. This is something they care about. Why are we saying that students shouldn't have a say? Compromise is a good one. But we shouldn't have a right to vote on this.

James: was that vote on a referendum where we understood? or is this about JCR Presidents who were impassioned without reading it, like me?

Adam Smith (Balliol): I emailed round JCR on whether or not do we want a referendum. Gave a summary of points etc. and 50 people wanted a referendum, 7 against. The view of OUSU is that the exec has too much power, and that not enough is put to students. Ridiculous where a situation inspires passion and where people are confused, we should have an educated referendum. This policy still gives a lot of power to exec. Balliol did speak out, others should be allowed to.

Rich: I am sick of no platform debates. Last term no platform was a buzz word. Everyone had a view, whether informed or not. At the very least we need to reassess what this means and what can be done. We need to retake a sample of public opinion. We will probably have to amend this motion.

Jonny Medland: I've been objecting to no platform and wanted it to be repealed. Referendum is not the right thing to do. No facts were ever challenged, but in fact everyone was misinformed. Last year's sabs were misinformed or lying. 10 JCRs last term were voting on something which has now changed since we understand the policy better. Council will always be able to decide on who can use resources. No matter what ever happens. A referendum will be about symbolism.

Ingrid Frater: referendums should be saved for useful issues. Remember that Council can make decisions. There are issues which students care about. Not sure about this.

Stefan Baskerville: JCRs were uninformed. People haven't read the policy. This is uncontroversial. Exec should have the power to ban individuals to use resources to incite violence. I have things I want to do this term. Want good debates, not about this issue.

James Lamming proposed an amendment.

James Lamming wants to consult students. Wants a referendum on a prudent use of resources. If people want a chance to consult CRs, then that's right.

Marlene Cayoun: speech in opposition: this will need our colleges' resources.

Joseph Edwards (Jesus): surely this is just a JCR motion?

Marlene: this will need us to educate our Crs.

Rich Hardiman: in all likelihood last term your students heard no platform through a certain prism. We need to find out.

Paul Dwyer: this is so fluid that we need to have a referendum. We can have an iron clad policy. Let's determine now once and for all. Students should have their say.

Move to vote on the amendment.

Marius Kempe (Worcester): lots of people asking. We let it be and then we would discuss this next term. Would be great to now go back and talk to JCR.

Lewis Iwu opposition. This is important to discuss more.

43 in favour of move

11 against

4 abstentions

Move to vote passed.

Amendment

51 votes in favour

Amendment passed.

Move to vote by James (St John's): this is going round in circles. Would like a chance to consult CR. Sealed and signed.

Rich Hardiman against the move to vote. Still high-running tensions.

Move to vote passed.

Speech in proposition Jonny Medland: Ask that people vote in favour. Two issues: do we need referendum? Is this policy good enough that we don't need to go ahead?

Speech in Opposition Marlene Cayoun: Motion is changed completely. Spent all of last term talking about it. Resent idea we don't know what we were doing. This will take too long and be a major hassle. Why should we spend further time and resources? Please don't make us do it – it's been done already.

Votes in favour: 47

Votes against: 15

Abstentions: 6

Access and Admissions Policy

This is very important. Table for the moment. Go back and discuss in CR meeting. Send amendments.

VC Motion

Motion was tabled.

SAS Review Group

Louise Randall gave speech in proposition.

Jonny Medland: how will this be different from the last one?

Louise: we have more to think about. goal will be a binary group.

Motion passed.