

# OUSU

c o u n c i l   m i n u t e s

## **1st week Council held at 5.30pm on Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> April in the Vernon Harcourt Room at St Hilda's College**

- a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
- b. Matters Arising from the Minutes
- c. Ratifications in Council
- d. Elections in Council
- e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers
- f. Reports from the Executive Officers who wish to make reports
- g. Questions to Members of the Executive
- h. Emergency Motions
- i. Passage of Motions Nem Con
- j. Motions of No Confidence or Censure
- k. First readings of Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders
- l. The Budget or Amended Budget
- m. Motions Authorising Capital Expenditure
- n. Other Motions
  - i. motions affecting ousu members as ousu members
  - ii. motions affecting ousu members as students at Oxford University
  - iii. motions affecting ousu members as members of the student movement
  - iv. motions affecting ousu members as residents of Oxford
  - v. motions affecting ousu members as residents of the United Kingdom
  - vi. motions affecting ousu members as citizens of the world
- o. Any Other Business

---

### **a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

7<sup>th</sup> Week Council

Minutes passed no matters arising

Termly Council

Minutes passed no matters arising.

The Chair gives Stefan Baskerville the opportunity to speak regarding the proposed new Memorandum and Articles.

Stefan Baskerville (Univ)

The point of me talking is draw attention to mem and arts which were circulated to the mailists requesting comments, the comments we have received have been looked at by lawyers and included as appropriate.

Remember Urgent Challenges proposal about membership of OUSU being all students, which we voted on last term as it follows the guidelines of the NUS. Makes the charity responsible to all members. This membership structure is set out in mem and arts, Basically establishing the structure of new company. By incorporating the limited liabilities of trustees. The other significant things in here are details of AGMs and the structure and composition of trustee board. Introducing external trustees, brought in because they have specific experience and a range of skill sets useful to a company.

Draw attention to Article 31. At minimum please read and engage with the proposed structure of trustee board, as this will be able to overthrow decisions made by OUSU council. Only reasons for this are legal reasons, and anything else not in interests of charity. We have thought of number of ways of composing trustee board, lots of computations, highly unusual for more than 50% of the trustee board being paid employees, so would have to have a strong case for the 6 sabs being on. External trustees will be elected via a vote of council. Nominee Committee University would like to have representation on this, a good thing because Uni know a lot of people, also want some say and this is a good way of limiting the amount of say they can have. OUSU council can also remove trustees.

I will circulate the new version shortly. Composition of OUSU council, structure of exec not in there, OUSU Council is the constitution makers right now. Want to leave as much in the bye laws the constitution and standing orders as possible, so leaves as much as possible for OUSU council to make decisions on.

Have a look and see what you think and let me know. Hope is for us to adopt this term, will change constitution and standing order as appropriate, this should ensure we can do all of this in this financial year.

Rob Shearer (Lincoln):

Do you intend to give votes back to disaffiliates without forcing them to reaffiliate?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Not sure we can do this. Depends whether you want to keep the right of disaffiliation. Have to get the colleges consent that they want to reaffiliate.

Jesse Harber (St Hilda's)

If affiliation is no longer about money, or vote in council. Then being affiliated means nothing

POI

Jonny Medland (The Queen's)

Under 1994 Education Act, all colleges are student unions, you have to vote to affiliate to external bodies. We have no jurisdiction over colleges as we are an external body to them

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)

Endorse OUSU on merits of affiliation, and whether you want to take part in or whether you like it.

---

### **c. Ratifications in Council**

**Presidential Rule of Interpretation** regarding governance changes in Trinity term 2010.

In order to incorporate as a company limited by guarantee prior to registering with the Charity Commission as a charity, OUSU needs to adopt a Memorandum & Articles of Association. OUSU also needs to amend its existing Constitution and Standing Orders, reconciling them into a set of Bye-Laws. As there is no process laid down in the OUSU Constitution to adopt a new set of governing documents superseding the Constitution I make the following rule of interpretation under Standing Order 1.2.1:

**"For the avoidance of doubt the Memorandum & Articles of Association can be adopted by a simple majority vote in OUSU Council, subject to the provisions of Section B of the Standing Orders and Article B of the Constitution. This interpretation is in line with existing practice whereby all motions before Council pass by simple majority unless otherwise explicitly stated in the Constitution or Standing Orders".**

Stefan Baskerville  
University College  
OUSU President

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

So I have told you about mem and arts and this is to clarify how we envisage the process going forward. No process in constitution specified on how to do this.

SFQ

Andrew Whitby (Balliol):

Since mem and arts, sits above constitution would you not think to accept this then surely should be same as to amend constitution?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

We are going to have to do so many changes. No financial barrier to votes in OUSU council, so can affiliate and take part. Legitimate body to pass these changes. If we do referendums on mem and arts, constitution standing orders etc, think everyone might get fed up of them.

Ratification passes

---

## d. Elections in Council

**The following positions will be elected in OUSU Council of 1<sup>st</sup> week. To nominate for any of these positions please e-mail [enquiries@ousu.org](mailto:enquiries@ousu.org) by midday on Tuesday, April 27**

**The OUSU Returning Officer.** The Returning Officer is responsible for running all OUSU elections in Hilary Term 2010, including elections in Council and any cross-campus elections.

No one standing

**2 Deputy Returning Officers.** The Deputy Returning Officers assist the Returning Officer in running all OUSU elections. For more information on being either the Returning Officer or a Deputy Returning Officer please e-mail [president@ousu.org](mailto:president@ousu.org)

Daniel Alphonsus stood

Stefan Baskerville (As Acting RO):

Few questions and then a minute to explain who and why.

Daniel Alphonsus:

Balliol College, member of OCA and no and no.

Saw email from Stefan, thought would be interesting as have stood in elections in JCR and Union. Like to see from other side, no experience of OUSU, but think could do a good job.

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

You will be running cross campus ballots if we have referendums and if we don't get a returning officer.

Daniel Alphonsus (Balliol):

If would have to be RO how much time would it take?

Stefan: Baskerville (Univ):

Don't take a long time thinking about it. Don't know could be significant. Think mute point if discover too much burden then you can resign and we would have to find a replacement.

Yuan Yuang (Balliol):

Daniel I believe in you. Was wondering if there were criticisms of the process?

Daniel Alphonsus (Balliol):

I think as DRO, major problem didn't really think how effecting me, most of the positions didn't think would assist me. Online election system good way simple. Not much to criticise.

**I Humanities Divisional Board Representative (Undergraduate Place).** The Humanities Divisional Board is the top decision-making body for all Humanities subjects at Oxford and needs an undergraduate Humanities student to be a student representative on it for Trinity Term 2010. You will need to go to Divisional Board meetings (2 per term) and Academic Committee meetings (2 per term). Email

[access@ousu.org](mailto:access@ousu.org) for more information.

Hannah Cusworth

Brasenose, College, Labour party, Fabian Society, No and No

Academic affairs officer, main reason because do history and politics and had problems, and another reason is funding and the other is new humanities building would be good if divisional structures improved on and good if have 1<sup>st</sup> hand knowledge of these.

Jack Matthews (St Peter's):

Have joint consultative forum, where the college reps meet with divisional rep, will you be pushing for it. MPLS.

Hannah Cusworth (Brasenose);

Will find out views of new chairs and if case yes

Both elected

---

## **e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers**

### **Stefan Baskerville - President**

Not report at great length, in yellow booklet lots of different sections. Hoped to report on NUS conference but will come as a motion next time. Otherwise all in her.

No questions

### **Kat Wall – VP Women**

No questions

### **Sarah Hutchinson – VP Graduates**

Want to add one thing, Jonny and I and some reps from Somerville MCR about graduate access work, getting people from different backgrounds. Really productive meeting, think Somerville may try out a meeting event so that undergraduates from JCR can speak to members of the MCR really excited, and thought would bring up in case other people interested in taking on.

No questions

### **Jonny Medland – VP Access & Academic Affairs**

All in report

No questions

### **Eorann Lean – VP Charities & Community**

All in report

Questions:

Daniel Lowe (St Edmund):

Teams for fair-trade stash. So will sabs be entering a team for the calender?

No because already have fair-trade stash so no. The teams are being finalised at the moment.

### **Dani Quinn – VP Welfare**

We have made a little booklet guide about what sabbatical positions are, wouldn't have written so much propaganda if didn't think jobs were really good. Please take a look have a think and get in touch

No questions

## **f. Reports from the Executive Officers who wish to make Reports**

### **Hannah Cusworth – Academic Affairs Campaign Officer**

No

### **Jack Matthews – Common Room Support Officer**

No

### **Jasper Minton-Taylor – LBGTQ Officer**

No

### **Yuan Yang – Women’s Officer**

This Monday last ever husting for your local candidate, for Oxford East. 5.45pm in Wadham, Moser theatre, email questions to me and on the spot questions if you haven’t thought of them.

Tomorrow in Balliol, 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of our mixed gender group the mixed pie group. Will be discussing social gender constructions which are formed in magazines. Please come along bring a gender magazine along, and will talk about. 5.30pm

### **Dannielle Fraser Solomon – Students with Disabilities Officer**

I have got the SWD campaign started up again and we had our first meeting a few days ago and it went really well. If want to get involved email [diversity@ousu.org](mailto:diversity@ousu.org), to get on mailing list.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

I have a question about the election for VP Graduates. Final electoral ruling.

Jonny Medland (The Queen’s):

2 ways RO needs make announcement one on OUSU noticeboard, also places online on OUSU website. The numbers are up on website.

The Acting Returning Officer, should seek the reports from both Ex returning officer. Going to be a delay in this, as both are doing finals

Final electoral ruling comes 48 hours after results of the election. This would have been Ronnie’s first time to deliver report.

The Report of the returning officer states whether elections ran freely or fairly. Basic legal observation.

Opportunity to make complaints passed.

Procedural Motion

Dawn Hollis (Balliol):

I propose that we should move down the agenda and that this query could be answered after the meeting.

Opposition to Procedural motion

I have sent lots of emails on this. Procedural motion to address in private, have tried to get in touch with Stefan and RO, and I don’t want to be here. Couldn’t be anything more important than elections being addressed immediately

Votes for moving on

For: 35

Against: 4

Abstension: I

---

## **h. Emergency Motions**

### **Ruling on Emergency Motion**

28.iv.2010

A motion has been submitted for consideration at today's meeting of OUSU Council after the deadline for motions, and I am required, under Standing Order B.1.2.c, to rule on whether the subject of the motion has "substantially arisen" since the aforementioned deadline.

The subject of the motion is the refusal of the Russell Group and the Department of Business, Innovation & Skills to release the submission of the former to the Browne Review. I note that the correspondence relating to this refusal was made public after the deadline for motions, and I feel that this is a substantial change in the situation.

I therefore rule that this motion satisfies the conditions laid out in Standing Order B.1.2.c, and order that it be added to the agenda for the meeting of Council scheduled to commence at 5.30pm today.

Joseph Wales  
Chair of Council

### **1. Against Russell Group Secrecy on Fees**

#### **Council Notes:**

1. That in November 2009 the government set up an independent review group (the Browne Review) to consider options for the future funding of higher education.
2. That this group will report back with recommendations at some point in the autumn of this year.
3. That the Browne Review's initial call for evidence took place in December 2009 and January of 2010 focusing on how the funding and student support system for UK students has worked since 2006.
4. That the second call for evidence is currently open and asking for submissions on how a future funding system for higher education could work.
5. That universities, student unions (including OUSU) and other organisations and individuals made submissions to phase 1 of the Review, all of which have been published on the Browne Review website.
6. That the only exception to this is the Russell Group (the group of 20 leading research-intensive universities including Oxford) which has withheld its submission from public release.
7. That OUSU submitted a Freedom of Information request for this submission on February 1 2010 which was denied on February 23 as the information was intended for release at a later date and would be published "this week".
8. That the submission by the London School of Economics to the Browne Review specifically referred to the 'Russell Group submission', confirming that such a submission does exist.
9. That the information was not published within the timeframe provided.
10. That the Department of Business, Innovation & Skills and Russell Group then failed to respond to further requests for the submission in March and April until OUSU threatened to take the Department of Business, Innovation & Skills to the Information Commissioner over the issue.
11. That the Russell Group has still refused to release its submission to the Browne Review.
12. That BIS has confirmed that "The Russell Group has requested that its evidence remain confidential while it continues to work on the remainder of the report, without public comment on sections of internal drafts that were shared in confidence with the Review."
13. That BIS has now invited OUSU to appeal the initial decision to withhold the information to an "internal review".
14. That OUSU has now done this but has not yet received either an acknowledgement or a response.
15. That this news story is currently the top story on the BBC Education website.
16. That all email correspondence between OUSU and BIS can be found online at [www.ousu.org](http://www.ousu.org).

**Council Believes:**

1. That all submissions to the Browne Review should be made public and that the debate over the future of Britain's universities should take place in the public domain.
2. That the collaboration between the Browne Review and the Russell Group in withholding the Russell Group's evidence is unacceptable and should cease.
3. That the Russell Group should release their submission to phase 1 of the Browne Review immediately and should release their submission to phase 2 when every other submission is made public.

**Council Resolves:**

1. To mandate the OUSU Executive to continue lobbying the Russell Group to release their submission to the Browne Review immediately.
2. To mandate the OUSU Executive to lobby Oxford University to encourage the Russell Group to release their submission to the Browne Review immediately.
3. To condemn the Russell Group's willingness to lobby the Browne Review in private but not make its evidence public.

**Proposed: Jonny Medland (The Queen's)**  
**Seconded: Stefan Baskerville (University)**

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

So some of you will know quite a lot especially if you are a JCR Pres. Last September the Browne review was set up which will report back later this year on what the funding system for HE in the UK will look like. Invited submissions on how system had worked and 90 groups made submissions all but 1 published. The one that wasn't was Russell group, the Russell group hasn't made it's report public, which goes against what was said, also goes against what the Department of Business and Education said would happen It goes against freedom of information. So essentially in logjam, bbc website public. Russel group significant cos it has a lot of power as a lobbying group. Refusing to say in public, somewhat surprisingly taken a long time to hit the press, so it is now in open, still refusing to release. Thing have in common is because after election, was to remove from the agenda for the general election. What this motion is asking you to do is continue to mandate us lobbying for this submission to be released, also lobby the university to get them to lobby for its release. Also to condemn the fact that they haven't made their report public.

James Nation (Merton)

Are you still pursuing action to the information .are you still taking down legal route now in press.

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Trying to get released.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmund):

Are you seeking support from other members of Russell group

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Yes and most Russell member groups submitted individual

Alice Heath (Univ):

Do you have any idea what is in it?

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

LSE report did something on funding. Journalists seem to think about higher fees, potential no cap on fee but really speculation

Charlie Wilson

Other university outside Russell group? Are they making any response?

I talked to other universities UK, to see if they knew anything. Russell group has more clout, their response will get back to so think trying to work out what to do

Motion passes

---

## **i. Passage of Motions Nem Con**

### **1. Peer Marking**

Opposition

---

### **2. Against Cuts to Higher Education Funding**

#### **Council Notes:**

1. That the HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council for England) teaching grant to universities has been cut by 1.6% for 2010/11 on the 2009/10 year.
2. That HEFCE research funding to universities for 2010/11 has been frozen compared to 2009/10.
3. That HEFCE funding for university capital projects has been cut by 15% for 2010/11 on the 2009/10 year.
4. That total UK expenditure on higher education is 1.3% of GDP, less than both the OECD average of 1.4% of GDP and the US expenditure of 2.9% of GDP.
5. That adjusted for inflation the 'unit of resource' per home undergraduate at UK universities was less in 2008/09 than it was in 1989/90.
6. That for every £1 million of UK government funding in 2007/08 universities generated £4.14 million in economic output.
7. That the total economic output of UK higher education in 2007/08 represented 2.3% of UK GDP.
8. That ministers have indicated that further cuts to higher education in the coming years are likely.
9. That the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford has frequently noted the funding cuts to universities which have been announced since he took office on October 1 2009 but is yet to formally condemn them.

#### **Council Believes:**

1. That there is an inherent value to the pursuit of knowledge and that universities are critical to this end.
2. That higher education has both quantifiable economic benefits (as outlined above) but also has broader cultural and social benefits.
3. That the threat of deep cuts to higher education threatens the quality of teaching, research and infrastructure of UK universities.
4. That cuts threaten British economic success when competing in the a global economy.
5. That these cuts should be strongly opposed by students, academics and university administrators.
6. That Oxford University enjoys a significant profile within the national media and influence with government.

#### **Council Resolves:**

1. To condemn the funding cuts to higher education which have already been announced.
2. To mandate the OUSU President to lobby the Vice-Chancellor to issue a statement condemning the announced cuts to university funding and to oppose any further cuts.
3. To mandate the OUSU President to report back to Council on the Vice-Chancellor's response to this request.
4. To mandate the President to request from the University that OUSU representatives are included in any discussions about where cuts to Oxford's funding should fall.

**Proposed: Jonny Medland (The Queen's)**

**Seconded: Stefan Baskerville (University)**

No opposition. Motion Passes

### **3. Support for a Living Wage**

#### **Council notes:**

1. That a Living Wage is calculated according to a living costs index, to ensure that the recipient can afford a basic and decent standard of living.
2. That the Living Wage campaign in the UK was started in London in 2001 by the broad-based organisation London Citizens, and has since delivered millions of pounds of extra wages to thousands of low paid workers in London, including employees of HSBC, Barclays, KPMG, the London Development Agency, the Greater London Authority, the Department for Children Schools and Families, Queen Mary University London, and the London School of Economics.
3. That the successful method of campaigning in London involved a coalition of groups from civil society including student unions, schools, churches and mosques.
4. That the current London Living Wage is £7.60 an hour.
5. That the current Oxford Living Wage is £7.01 an hour.
6. That OUSU has a Living Wage campaign.
7. That Oxford City Council is a Living Wage employer, after working closely with OUSU's Living Wage campaign.
8. That OUSU has Living Wage policy, which mildly supports a Living Wage.
9. That OUSU only contracts for one cleaner for a few hours per week and the costs of an increase in wages are unlikely to be high.
10. That there are many cleaners employed by the University who are paid less than a Living Wage.

#### **Council believes:**

1. That people should be paid enough to live decently, and the best way to ensure this is to support a Living Wage.
2. That a Living Wage also makes good business sense: research by KPMG shows that Living Wage employers have higher rates of productivity and fewer days taken off sick by employees.
3. That OUSU should ensure it lives by its principles and works with others to achieve its goals.
4. That all OUSU employees should be paid a Living Wage.
5. That employees of the University and its Colleges should be paid a Living Wage.

#### **Council resolves:**

1. To mandate the President to ensure that all staff employed by OUSU are paid a Living Wage.
2. To mandate the President to write to the City Council to congratulate them on becoming a Living Wage employer, and to open a conversation about how to widen the number of low paid workers in Oxford who are paid a Living Wage.
3. To mandate the President to raise the issue of the Living Wage with the Vice-Chancellor and seek his agreement for it in principle.
4. To mandate the President to work with Common Room Presidents and the Living Wage campaign to establish what the Colleges pay their low-paid staff.
5. To encourage Common Rooms to consider the issue of a Living Wage and make efforts to see it implemented in their colleges.

**Proposed: Stefan Baskerville (University)**

**Seconded: Daniel Stone (St Peter's)**

Please note that this policy would amend current OUSU policy on the Living Wage which reads as follows: 'Believes that there are reasonable grounds to suspect that the pay and conditions of all university staff are not as good as they could be or, if things were fair, should be. As a matter of principle, we should take an interest in the lives of those who work for the university, which provide our education and, should they have concerns about their work, be prepared to stand by them in advocating change. It would be premature to act on any matter relating to workers at our university without first ascertaining as best we can what experience there is of working for the university, and if there are any grievances. Resolves to ask the President to investigate what patterns of wages, outsourcing, unionisation and work conditions exist for lower paid workers across the

university and encourage JCRs and MCRs to pursue research of the same focus. To work with Oxford TUC and Unison on the above.'

No opposition

---

#### **4. Strategic Review**

Opposition motion moves to full debate.

---

#### **5. Citizens UK**

##### **Council notes:**

1. That Citizens UK is the national organisation for community organising in the UK, with alliances in Milton Keynes and London, and interest from various groups in Oxford, among other places.
2. That London Citizens is a broad-based alliance of groups from civil society, including churches, mosques, synagogues, student unions, trade unions, resident associations, ethnic associations and other groups, that began with 30 members in East London in 1996 and now has more than 150 members.
3. That London Citizens draws its agenda from its membership, and exists to build the capacity of its members to get them to change what they seek.
4. That Citizens UK is having an impact on national politics: parts of its agenda are being included in party manifestos or are items for discussion in the election, including a Living Wage.
5. That Citizens UK are holding a National Assembly on Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> May, at which they will seek a working relationship with the leaders of the three main political parties and ask them to make clear their position on policy questions including a Living Wage.
6. That the Assembly will be held at Methodist Central Hall in Westminster and there will be around 2000 people in attendance.
7. That OUSU has a Living Wage campaign.
8. That OUSU has a developing relationship with Citizens UK.
9. That Citizens UK have provided training this year for Common Room presidents on negotiation. The training received positive feedback from participants.
10. That OUSU have been invited by Citizens UK to send a representative from Oxford to the National Assembly.

##### **Council believes:**

1. That the training offered by Citizens UK gives an alternative and complementary perspective on negotiation, leadership and representation to that offered by NUS and other external partners such as McKinsey.
2. That the training offered by Citizens UK assists common room presidents and OUSU Exec members in thinking about how they deliver for their constituents.
3. That it is in students' and Common Rooms' interests that OUSU's relationship with Citizens UK continues to develop.
4. That attending the assembly will signify OUSU's interest in strengthening the relationship between the two organisations and will further the Living Wage agenda.

##### **Council resolves:**

1. To mandate the President to attend the Citizens UK National Assembly to represent Oxford students on 3<sup>rd</sup> May.
2. To mandate the President to report back on the Assembly.
3. To mandate the President to write to Citizens UK to express OUSU's interest in a continued working relationship and to indicate OUSU's support for the Living Wage.

**Proposed:**     **Stefan Baskerville (University)**

**Seconded:**   **Daniel Stone (St Peter's)**

No opposition motion passes nem con.

## n. Other Motions

### I. Peer Marking

#### Council Notes:

1. That OUSU Council passed policy in week 1 of Hilary Term 2010 mandating the OUSU Executive to campaign on improving undergraduate understanding of marking criteria.
2. That over the course of Hilary Term 2010 the OUSU Executive followed this policy.
3. That as a result of campaigning efforts so far every Department in the university has been asked to review its undergraduate marking criteria and the efforts that they make to publicise these.
4. That in week 6 of last term Senior Tutors' Committee considered a proposal developed by OUSU and the Oxford Learning Institute in support of peer marking.
5. That peer marking is a practice by which students mark each others work in a tutorial setting with the aim of improving their understanding of the criteria on which they are being assessed.
6. That peer marking is widely recognised within educational literature as having proven pedagogical benefits.
7. That Senior Tutors' Committee was positive about the proposals and recognised the benefits which peer marking has if utilised effectively.
8. That in -1st week of Trinity Term Senior Tutors were reminded of this proposal and asked to trial it for students in the run up to prelims in Trinity Term 2010.

#### Council Believes:

1. That it is unacceptable that 4 years worth of data from the National Student Survey demonstrates that final year Oxford undergraduates have less understanding of the criteria against which they are being assessed than students nationally, at Russell Group universities and at the University of Cambridge.
2. That for students to fulfil their academic potential they need to understand the criteria against which they are being marked.
3. That an understanding of marking criteria is important for a students' well-being, since a lack of understanding of it can undermine confidence in their own abilities.
4. That now Senior Tutors are broadly supportive of proposals relating to peer marking lobbying should take place in colleges to ensure their implementation.

#### Council Resolves:

1. To mandate the OUSU Executive to produce guidance for Common Rooms on peer marking and how it can work in colleges.
2. To encourage Common Room representatives to discuss peer marking with their Senior Tutors with a view to its implementation before Prelims in Trinity Term 2010.

**Proposed:** **Jonny Medland (The Queen's)**

**Seconded:** **Hannah Cusworth (Brasenose)**

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Back story, council voted for us to away and look into this, we campaigned on it in Hilary. Got departments to review their marking criteria.

Lot of support for peer marking, started looking at last term, and have got a broadly favourable response. Encourage implementations for Prelims.

What peer marking does? Proposal developed with oxford learning institute lots of support, but will need to be implemented carefully, would need to make sure student not stressed out. This view was taken at an academic affairs meeting, goal to introduce in colleges and subjects.

Alice Heath (Univ):

If this happens and tutors aren't keen are there other things we can do to encourage them?

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Encourage a culture of students advising their tutors that they don't understand marking criteria. Mismatch between skills and what learning and what need for exams.

Christina Head

Tutors will shove marking on other students, so will get less feedback from academics.

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Could be a risk if not introduced carefully. Think good one's who have done are happy to take feedback. Could propose an amendment if you want.

Would you make the students mark in tutorials?

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Depends, all anonymised, students don't know who's work marking. Very discursive, or can do outside tutes. Either.

Strongly suspect those least likely to introduce are not the best. Could introduce tutor training. Outcome is that by time you are an Oxford graduate, qualified to teach, but since hired on academic abilities doesn't follow.

At the moment various types, trained how to interview candidates, and refresher courses. Oxford learning institute run a course which applies to post docs and grad students. Applies mainly to those that come from other institutions

Amendment 1

Taken as friendly.

Question:

How would this work, the idea?

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Clearly inappropriate times Michaelmas term for first years, to late for finalists, whereas may be a good idea to do for prelims as still have time and also close to exams, if works brilliantly can look at more. If doesn't then nothing lost.

Question:

How would it work on getting Senior Tutors permission, would it then be up to individual tutors.

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Up to individual tutors, if a tutor was tutoring loads of students at other colleges could still do it.

Yuan Yang (Balliol):

Are there ground rules?

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

All the people whose work is being marked would be in review. Think should be guidelines

Dawn Hollis

What would you do in arts subject when tutes are one or two people?

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Could have a tute a term, but some examples where not feasible, like one on one tutorials. It is basically meant to have benefits for people who use it, some just unfeasible.

Jack Matthews (St Peter's):

I have been in tutes where only two have marked in each other works. Generally considered my JCC of MPLS

Question:

Is there a reason why motion doesn't include, campaign for refreshers sessions for people that have been here a long time.

Jonny Medland (The Queen's)

Only reason is because focussed on narrow issue.

Yes will still get feedback from tutors, thanks for info as it gives info for guidance notes.

Geraint Jones

Are you lobbying for science as much as arts?

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Definitely some subjects more useful than others. Some subjects where marking criteria more confusing than others.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmund):

Please do it for science subjects

Dawn Hollis

Will you suggest guidance for intra college peer marking. Suggest to tutors good idea yes.

Motion passes

---

## **2. Against Cuts to Higher Education Funding**

Motion passed nem con

---

## **3. Support for a Living Wage**

No opposition motion passed nem con

---

## **4. Strategic Review**

Council Notes:

1. That in 3<sup>rd</sup> week Michaelmas Term 2009 Council established a Strategic Review Group composed of the President (ex officio), General Manager (ex officio), two members of the OUSU Executive (elected in Executive), two members of OUSU Council (elected in Council), the President-Elect (ex officio).
2. That the remit of the group was to investigate the role for OUSU and the range of activities in which OUSU should engage, in improving the student experience at Oxford.
3. That the group consulted in the following ways: an online student survey, multiple focus groups, inviting and receiving individual submissions and holding individual meetings with interested students.
4. That the group has conducted discussions covering the range of OUSU's activities and has produced a draft report of its findings.
5. That the report is on the Council agenda for initial discussion, and will be discussed again later in the term.
6. That any student can comment on any recommendation or part of the Report by emailing [strategicreview@ousu.org](mailto:strategicreview@ousu.org), and all students are encouraged to do so.
7. That the group will be considering the draft report in light of any submissions received, and will be submitting a final report later in the term.

**Council believes:**

1. Common Room Presidents and OUSU Reps should read the report and comment on it.
2. Common Room Presidents should circulate the report to their members and invite feedback to [strategicreview@ousu.org](mailto:strategicreview@ousu.org).

**Council resolves:**

1. To note the report.
2. Mandate strategic review committee to release an updated review by third week council to include further information on how conclusions were reached.

**Proposed:** **Stefan Baskerville (University)**

**Seconded:** **Dani Quinn (Merton)**

Speech in proposition

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Hello council try not to talk for too long have motion in front of you. It would be useful you have one. If not loads on table. In 3<sup>rd</sup> of Michaelmas term established group with broad format composition specified in motion. Discussed how would consult, used many methods. 50 people took part in focus groups, having done survey read submissions, we set out to discuss as much as possible. A lot of discussions and bouncing of ideas, made notes of each meeting we held, what have in booklet result of this process. Very much in draft. Some errors with punctuation, 18,000 words long which is terrible. But exec summary at start. As it says in here, a draft for you to read and comment on, like dislike, more information or less. Some people have asked for more statistics, which could put in.

Would like you to read at the very least the exec summary, and then find the sections your interested in.

Actually a lot is very practical, much less big picture than some other unions do. Think big picture is worthwhile process. Think this is just a first step, this is not a strategic plan, plenty more thinking to be done. Important to get right answers shouldn't be rushed. Encourages comments and circulation to students.

Higher education landscape changing funding problems will be a problem, need for a strong union vitally important. 2<sup>nd</sup> thing development of university points to the need for a good student union. Trajectory of colleges over time is much more about them giving equal service. Need for us to have a powerful voice vitally important.

Representation most important for OUSU. This was number one for everyone, imp for OUSU to do well. Support of individual students and common rooms. Recommendations on improving representation, could improve way we report back. Training for scrutiny committee, sending exec reports to entire student body, so all people can see what we are doing.

Concluded survival guide should be published online and no longer published because expensive. Maintain service but save money.

Think we should explore possibility of a second student advisor who works 15 hours a week, her work is critical but the burden is pushing the point where it becomes unviable. This would mean getting another salary so would need to explore further.

Common room support, want to continue to develop training opportunities, especially with external parties. We think NUS should be delivering training twice a term. We think OUSU could expand into providing support to clubs and societies as they are badly supported at this time. In terms of grad engagement want to increase grad attendance at OUSU council. Help with academic life. Div brd reps votes on OUSU council other ways increase more integration with national and cultural society. A big event at start of year for grads, pref a social event.

Recs about exec which need to be discussed by exec. Exec as a body has changed. Has expanded in size but continued week on week.

More active and visible campaign, greater student engagement, greater support for campaigns, really significant knowledge gap between what students think OUSU is doing and what OUSU is actually doing.

New sabbatical officer to deal with deficiencies. Leading on campaigns. Recommendation is that this replaces VP C & C, whole discussion to be had on this. If you want to engage with this, then read the thinking in sab section and then we can begin talking about it.

SFQ

Jack Matthews (St Peter's):

To solve problem about making data available, not to appear to be like Russell Group could the figures be put on website and then a link.

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Yes intend to do, but not sure it answers Ian's question. Will also be more useful for data in report

Section on communications and branding, needs to be very different from how it is now. We need to make it useful for students, big piece of work done.

Kat Wall (LMH):

Where do we go from here?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

How we envisage, is people engage and send us stuff, have meetings about, then group will review after all comments received and then later in term will make a final report of the group. Then harder as have to have a debate as to whether council agrees.

Amendment I

Speech in proposition

Ian Lyons (St Edmund)

Really approve of work of strategic review. We are being able to accept, as a documentation for consultation but don't think we know enough yet. Need to know why the areas were considered. Need to look at methodology, accept fully many areas mentioned as important, not sure what differences are. Also makes recommendation of replacement of VP C & C, don't understand why the recommendations aren't separate. Need to know the thought process. Don't want much longer, but need to know aims and remit, methodology this is why proposing amendment.

Dani Quinn (Merton):

Speech in opposition

Really valuable feedback from Ian, if we don't release it then can't get feedback, to make it better. Can't get feedback from everybody. Acknowledge a draft to get more feedback to ensure what comes back is a good one.

Debate

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

I basically agree with Dani, also agree with Ian, happy to clarify methodology, huge amount of information but really long. Read methodology and recommendations really important for people to engage in. It is going to come back to the review group, if it is out there then people will continue talking about it. More than happy to put in more work. Really would like people to get back on the substance of our ideas. Some things controversial would like substantive comments on what think on them. Don't want to waste time. Trinity term is best term to look at, as Michaelmas has Freshers'. This is why against amendment.

Show of hands on who has read whole report.

12 people have read.

Alice Heath (Univ):

Need to know thought process, but happy to see it now. But can we publish.

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

We have a lot of survey data, can send out initial analysis, and give tabs of who voted, is this what people want?

Would like data, don't want longer, but some things need clarifying.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmund)

Think really important separate feedback and comments on process. Really important we know how strategic review got to their conclusions. Need SR thought process specifically on major changes.

Don't think time constraints should be a concern, seen what happens when council rushes through changes. Way it happens is that council presented a document and have to agree or disagree.

Reason President Elect is on is for continuity shouldn't be just trinity term.

Don't think it should be any longer, but if people are going to read doesn't really matter if longer.

Sarah Hutchinson (St Cross):

My opinion is the more consultation the better, not convinced about how decisions made is the most important, what most important is where are we going to go from here. The longer we debate these decisions the better, can we put a couple of lines adding in the remit of this.

Jack Matthews (St Peter's):

In my opinion, whether this passes or not will not delay consultation. So whether passes or not can still comment, email strategic review. Think it is right that Council says SR g has done good job, but that still more work done, putting this info in can go out in a week, can go out before 3<sup>rd</sup> week council, then consultation can happen before council agrees this report. What done is brilliant but needs clarification.

Move to Vote

No opposition

Kat Wall (LMH):

Going back and forth points raised adequately in

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Opposition

Heading towards lack of quorum. Part of what I want to say is how this should be consulted on. Would have liked a broader discussion but should move on out of necessity.

26 in favour

7 against

1 abstention

Move to vote passes

Proposition

Ian Lyons (St Edmunds):

People here most engaged in student union, 12 people who have read, great difficulty getting considered widely, that's why it should be done properly, this is why it should go through.

Dani Quinn (Merton):

Disagree with Ian, thing about sub section is 7 pages long, we need to know what needs to be clarified and redefined. Think about people not reading not an issue.

Amendment

9 for

25 against

4 abstentions

Amendment fails.

Order a quorum count

Quorum still present

Another amendment

To add to council resolves 2.

Opposed as friendly.

This amendment is delayed until 5<sup>th</sup> week.

Amendment 3

Daniel Lowe's (St Edmund)

Insert resolves 2:

2. Mandate strategic review committee to release an updated review by 3<sup>rd</sup> week council to include further information on methodology and include further details on how conclusions were reached.

**Proposed: Daniel Lowe (St Edmund)**

**Seconded: Ian Lyons (St Edmund)**

Accepted as friendly motion stands amended

Point of Clarification

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Really good we are consulting on it, don't want acceptance of it by end of Trinity term. Think good to have in Trinity term as a lot of people engaged in it OUSU has a huge turnover, so could to have people who are engaged in it discussing it.

Sent an email to whole student population. Please read it as otherwise it will be a narrow group of people making decisions. If you want to know more then please email the group so we can give you information in detail rather than just expanding the document. Would hope people disagreed with it and don't be bored by it.

Motion passes.

---

## 5. Citizens UK

No opposition motion passes nem con.