

## Council Agenda

1<sup>st</sup> week trinity term 2012

1<sup>st</sup> Week Council to start at 5.30pm prompt, with sign in opening at 5.15pm on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> April. To be held in Oriel College.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, you should feel free to contact the Chair at any time on [chair@ousu.org](mailto:chair@ousu.org)

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
2. Matters Arising from the Minutes
3. Ratifications in Council
4. Elections in Council
5. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers
6. Reports from the Executive Officers who wish to make reports
7. Questions to Members of the Executive
8. Emergency Motions
9. Passage of Motions Nem Con
10. Motions of No Confidence or Censure
11. First readings of Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders
12. The Budget or Amended Budget
13. Motions Authorising Capital Expenditure
14. 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
15. Any Other Business

---

### d. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

No probs with minutes.

Ratifications in council.

---

### 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 a completed nominations form to [motions@ousu.org](mailto:motions@ousu.org) as soon as possible, as the deadline for nominations is midday on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> May April. Nominations form can be found

at: <http://www.ousu.org/democracy/ousucouncil/Election%20Application%20Form.doc/view>

1 position on Internal Affairs Committee

Tom Rutland (Jesus) elected.

## **Chair of Council**

Charlie Baker (St Catherine's) elected Chair of Council.

No questions or hushes.

## **JS-c(EC)SM**

David Butler at Jesus elected.

## **Presentation of The Budget**

Daniel Stone (St Peter's):

This will be coming to OUSU council again in 3<sup>rd</sup> week, please take a look on blue sheets. Shows OUSU and OSSSL last year £376,000 incl NUS fees.

Last year didn't get advertising as didn't do but now doing with Careers services, expected to make a profit of £30,000. Freshers' Fair income improve, made £5,000 from NUS. Welfare set against supplies. Sabbatical officers increased according to inflation. Student officer training increased so that increase services we can offer. Projects and outreach, money for campaigns, and safety bus and discretionary campaign budget.

There is going to be a jump in NUS affiliation fees, because of move to block grant, the University gives it specifically for NUS, won't just give for something else if don't affiliate. Mi-voice stays constant.

Website reflects the production of careers guide, rest is quite straight forward

Rob Noble (Linacre):

Introduce myself student member on budget and finance committee, Brona can't be here as unwell.

Question:

Why has the website from OUSU gone from £20,000 to £10,000?

Covers website and publications, this year produced alternative prospectus but this is only produced in alternate years, so isn't in next years budget.

Charlotte Baker elected Chair of Council.

---

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

Apologies from Martha and Yuan

### **VP Graduates - Jim O'Connell**

Jim nothing to add, look at the findings of the D-Phil review we did, I produced a wordle.

### **VP Access & Academic Affairs - Hannah Cusworth**

Hannah we all want to go play football so read the report.

### **VP Welfare & Equal Opportunities - Seb Baird**

Seb inaugural mind your head week next week, really important, take posters. Real shame if people missed out as didn't know where events where.

## **VP Charities & Communities - Daniel Stone**

Daniel if football cancelled come to RAG night at No 9.

---

### **e. Reports from Executive Officers**

#### **Environment & Ethics Officer - Beth Hanson-Jones**

Beth 2<sup>nd</sup> E & E rep meeting at Brasenose, get them to email name and dietary requirements.

#### **Common Room Support Officer - James Raynor**

James draw attention to what I've written about charity commission, colleges will have to make a decision on this in the next couple of years.

Questions to Exec

Passage of Motion Nem Com

Pushed to 3<sup>rd</sup> week no objections.

---

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

#### **1. Selecting RAG Charities**

##### **Council Notes:**

1. For the second consecutive year Oxford RAG trialled a cross campus election as a means of selecting the four charities they are going to support for the coming year.
2. Turnout in this election was approximately 4%, a slight reduction in turnout compared to last year.
3. Historically charities have been chosen in an open RAG meeting.
4. OUSU is currently in the process of revising its governing documents to fall in line with Charity law. One project will be to draft new regulations governing the selection of RAG charities.
5. The report in the appendix has been written by the Vice President (Charities and Community) as mandated by OUSU Council in 1<sup>st</sup> week council of Hilary Term 2012.

##### **Council Believes:**

1. That the trials have been successful enough to warrant support of the cross campus ballot as a permanent fixture.

##### **Council Resolves:**

1. To enshrine the RAG charity election as a cross campus ballot.
2. To approve the RAG Charity Elections Report and to draft regulations accordingly.

**Proposed:** *Daniel Stone, St Peter's College*

**Seconded:** *Jessica Tomkinson, Keble College*

#### **i. motions affecting ousu members as students at Oxford University**

#### **2. Student Involvement in allocating the new £9,000 tuition fee**

##### **Council Notes:**

1. That the University has set a tuition fee of £9,000 for Home/EU undergraduates who are beginning their degree in Michaelmas 2012.

2. In the University's response to the Government's White Paper 'Students at the Heart of the System' the University emphasised the importance of partnership
3. The first line of the University's response reads 'The University of Oxford believes that a university is a community where students and staff come together in a shared academic endeavour' and later in paragraph two that Students are partners in shaping their learning, not consumers of a narrowly defined educational product
4. There is currently a working group made up of 5 college and University members that is deciding how to allocate the new £9,000 undergraduate fee. The group has no student representation
5. The groups remit is also to consider the University's academic strategy and priorities for undergraduate teaching, and how these may be reflected by the way the new £9,000 fee is allocated
6. Despite receiving an assurance from the group's chair that student representatives would receive the agenda and papers for the meeting and could potentially attend the group, the chair has now retreated from this assurance.

#### **Council Believes:**

1. If the University talks about partnership with students they should put their words into action.
2. There is a difference between consultation and involvement.
3. Transparency is important, especially if students are to be partners in shaping their academic experience.
4. There is legitimate student interest in how the university is allocating the £9,000 fee.
5. Students could contribute valuable insights to the group's deliberations, especially on what undergraduate priorities for their teaching are.

#### **Council Resolves:**

1. To write to the members of the group outlining altering them to Council's position and opposition to the lack of student involvement.

**Proposed:** *Hannah Cusworth (Brasenose)*

**Seconded:** *Nick Cooper (St John's)*

Passed Nem Con

## **n. Other Motions**

- ii. motions affecting OUSU members as OUSU members

### **3. Safety Bus Review**

#### **Council Notes:**

1. The 'Safety Bus' is a joint partnership between OUSU and Oxford Brookes Student Union (OBSU). The service is made up of volunteers from Oxford University and Oxford Brookes and provides transportation around Oxford to those who contact the service between 9PM and 3AM (1AM on Sundays), when volunteers are available to staff the service.
2. The financial commitment from OUSU for the service in the 2011/12 academic year is £12000.
3. In 7<sup>th</sup> Week Council of Michaelmas Term 2011 the Vice President (Charities and Community) and Vice President (Women) were mandated to evaluate the service, promotion and provision of the Safety Bus. This report and its recommendations are the result.

**Council Believes:**

1. That the Safety Bus provides a valuable welfare service to members of Oxford Brookes University and the University of Oxford.
2. That it is undesirable that this service is only available for a fraction of the Oxford University academic year.

**Council Resolves:**

1. To endorse the second option outlined in the Safety Bus Review and to mandate the VP C&C to work with OBSU to investigate outsourcing the running of the Safety Bus.
2. To approve the Publicity Plan detailed in Section 8 of the Safety Bus Review.
3. To mandate the VP C&C to ensure that the Safety Bus runs for the duration of the Oxford University term time.

**Proposed:** *Daniel Stone, St Peter's College*

**Seconded:** *Oliver Gleeson, Christ Church*

iii. **Motions affecting OUSU members as residents of the United Kingdom**

iv. **Motions affecting OUSU members as citizens of the world**

---

**o. Any Other Business**

The OUSU Budget

## Appendix 1 for Council Motion 4. Selecting RAG Charities

### RAG Charity Election Report

This report into the RAG Charity Elections is based on two consecutive years of a cross campus election and preceding this, a process whereby charities were elected in an ordinary meeting of the RAG Committee.

I would like to start this report by thanking Jonathan Edwards, the Returning Officer for both cross campus elections for his continued support, professionalism and advice.

This report recommends that:

1. The cross campus election becomes an annual fixture, enshrined within OUSU regulations.
2. Campaigning should be allowed on behalf of one shortlisted charity.
3. Nominations should be restricted to charities registered in the UK and with a UK bank account.
4. The Vice President (Charities and Community) produces an annual report upon conclusion of the RAG Charity election, explaining why particular charities were or were not shortlisted.

The principal reasons for favouring the cross campus elections are:

1. Transparency: The nature of RAG events and its connection to OUSU should impel us to involve as many students as we can in deciding which charities to support.
2. Demand: A turnout of roughly 4% (800+ students) two years in a row, suggests that there is enough demand to warrant favouring this system over a one-off meeting.
3. Profile: The cross campus election has the potential to raise the profile of Oxford RAG and charitable activity across the University, with minimal costs.

### Background

Oxford RAG is the fundraising arm of the Student Union. Every year the RAG Executive, RAG Reps and Committees will organise events ranging from bungee jumps and street collections, to talent shows and the showpiece event, the RAG Ball. All the money raised from RAG events is split evenly between four charities selected annually of which two are local, one student run and one national or international.

Successful charities are collected from Trinity term of the year of their election to the end of the following Hilary term. Charities can expect to receive in the range of £5-15k each.

The election has historically taken place in a RAG meeting using the first-past-the-post where any OUSU member is entitled to vote. A cross-campus election was trialled for the first time in Hilary 2011 at the same time as the by-election for the Vice President (Graduates). Turnout in this election was 4% but no decision was made on whether or not to formally enshrine this election within OUSU governing documents, neither was a report written to outline the success or otherwise of the election.

This report aims to build on the evidence collated from two years of elections to fill this gap and allow OUSU Council to decide whether or not it wishes to enshrine the RAG charity elections as a cross campus election within its governing documents.

### Nominations

Charities are nominated by current members of OUSU. The nomination period is open from some time at the beginning of Hilary Term to 12pm on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> Week of Hilary Term.

In 2011 there were 50 nominations made, in 2012 this figure fell to 38 despite an increase in nominations from the student-run category (see table 1) It was surprising that relaxing the third

category from ‘national’ to ‘national/international’ did not lead to further nominations. In fact there was a marked reduction from 23 nominations to 16.

Category	2011	2012	Total
Student Run	10	13	23
Local	16	5	21
National/International	23	16	39
Non-UK registered (invalid)	1	4	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>88</b>

Table 1: Total Nominations Received

However the most concerning reduction was in the local category where we only had 5 nominations compared to 16 last year. Many local charities complained about not having a contact within the student population who could be used to nominate their charity.

At present we break inform students through the email messages, facebook and through the Oxford Hub. It may be necessary to make a more **concerted effort to reach out to local charities and students involved in charitable activity, to inform them of upcoming nominations.**

Having gone through the shortlisting process I can say wholeheartedly that the decision to restrict nominations to charities registered with the UK with a UK bank account was a sound one. The task of verification and comparing between charities was an arduous one, which undoubtedly would have become impossible had we not had reliable up-to-date information at hand via the Charity Commission website.

As expected it was found that there was a sudden rush near the close of nominations to get forms in on time (table 2); this could be alleviated by having a **clearly defined start time for nominations** as say Sunday 1<sup>st</sup> Week of Hilary Term.

Category	1 <sup>st</sup> Week	2 <sup>nd</sup> Week	3 <sup>rd</sup> Week	4 <sup>th</sup> Week	Total
Student-run	1	1	4	7	13
Local		1	3	1	5
National/International	2	1	2	11	16
Non-UK registered (invalid)		1	2	1	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>38</b>

Table 2: Nominations Received by Week

### Turnout and Publicity

Turnout in both years was roughly 4% in all categories. It was thought that the OUSU by-election in 2011 may have skewed the previous year’s result, but it now seems that 4% is the current natural rate of participation in the election.

It is difficult to evaluate the potential to increase turnout beyond 4%. This figure equates to over 800 students, which in itself is much greater than turnout that could be generated by any single RAG meeting. Given that the costs of using mi-voice are already sunk in an annual fee, there are clear benefits to RAG and OUSU in engaging more people within a democratic process.

The elections were open in 6<sup>th</sup> Week of Hilary Term from 8am on Tuesday to 6pm on Thursday. Carrying an election over three days was done to keep the RAG Charity elections at the same length as the OUSU elections. However there is nothing to suggest that voting would be negatively effected

were this window narrowed. In fact a more intense period of voting could actually make people more fervent in their campaigning. I have then suggested that we **reduce the election period to 8am Wednesday to 6pm Thursday, save when there is an OUSU by-election at which point both elections will run simultaneously.**

Turnout in the statutory annual election in Michaelmas Term was 19%, an increase of 5% from the previous year. It will be interesting to see over coming years whether or not turnout in the OUSU election correlates to that of the RAG charity election.

The OUSU election of course had an unprecedented number of candidates, all competing vigorously for student votes, as well as a generalised campaign initiated by OUSU to increase turnout.

In comparison the RAG charity election regulations forbade campaigning on behalf of any particular charity. I think this condition is unreasonable and impossible to enforce in practice. My recommendation is **to allow individuals to campaign on behalf of one shortlisted charity.**

Publicity this year was similar to that of the year before. The shortlist was given a page in the 5<sup>th</sup> Week Oxford Student Newspaper and the opening of elections was announced via facebook, the RAG mailing lists and the all student mailing list. It was also found that charities were using their mailing lists to ask their supporters to vote on their behalf. I think this behaviour should be permitted and encouraged in future elections.

However there was a problem that students misplaced and couldn't find the email with their Unique Voter Code. Often it was the case that people didn't know what to search for rather than the fact that they'd deleted it. I recommend **including a 'keyword' in the email sent out with the voter code.** It will have to be something short, unusual and memorable, so when students type 'Amarillo' into the search bar, up jumps the right email!

## **Post-election**

Efforts were made to inform unsuccessful applicants as quickly as possible and to encourage them to re-apply next year. We would hope that maintaining a relationship with charities would increase the number of nominations we receive year-on-year.

It would also be beneficial for the Vice President (Charities and Community) to **produce a written report after the election explaining why charities had or hadn't been shortlisted.** This is an important measure to guarantee transparency and fairness in the shortlisting process. I think the RAG President and Vice President (Charities and Community) should retain their powers to shortlist based on the criteria passed by OUSU Council, but that a mandatory written report would ensure that this criteria is in fact being observed.

## **Regulations**

Below I have written draft election regulations to govern future RAG charity ballots. OUSU is currently in the process of rewriting its governing documents and will shortly start drafting regulations.

**If approved by OUSU Council I will use these regulations as those to be transferred into the new OUSU regulations. The wording may be altered but the content of what Council decides will hold.**

## **Regulations**

Below I have written draft election regulations to govern future RAG charity ballots. OUSU is currently in the process of rewriting its governing documents and will shortly start drafting regulations.

If approved by OUSU Council I will use these regulations as those to be transferred into the new OUSU regulations. The wording may be altered but the content of what Council decides will hold.

### **RAG charities cross-campus ballot electoral regulations**

1. For the avoidance of doubt this ballot is not, with respect to the governing documents of OUSU, an election, referendum or indicative poll.
2. The ballot will be administered by the OUSU Returning Officer on behalf of Oxford RAG.
3. The ballot will use the Single Transferable Vote system as prescribed by the Electoral Reform Society.

#### **Time Line**

1. To nominate, a member of OUSU must propose the charity using the prescribed form, available from the OUSU website.
2. If a charity receives a single valid nomination it will not be disadvantaged if it also receives any invalid nominations.
3. The form must be sent to [rag.nominations@ousu.org](mailto:rag.nominations@ousu.org) after 12am Sunday 1<sup>st</sup> week and before 12 noon on Thursday of 4<sup>th</sup> week of Hilary Term.
4. The Vice President (Charities and Community) and the RAG President will produce a short list of charities to be presented to the electorate by Saturday 4<sup>th</sup> week.
5. The criteria for producing the short list shall be as follows:

#### Criteria for Short listing RAG charities

- 1) Only Charities registered in the United Kingdom with UK bank accounts will be selected
- 2) A maximum of 10 local charities will be short listed.
- 3) Local charities are defined as those who are based in Oxfordshire and the majority of their work is conducted in Oxfordshire.
- 4) A maximum of 5 student-run charities will be short listed.
- 5) A student-run charity is defined as one which was either founded by students (not necessarily students of the University of Oxford) and current students still maintain control or a student-lead branch of a charity where students of the University of Oxford hold executive control
- 6) A maximum of 5 national/international charities will be short listed
- 7) Any charity which has been selected as a RAG charity will be excluded from the short list for the following two years.
- 8) Any charity which has commissioned events from RAG where they are the sole beneficiaries of the profit will be excluded from the short list for one year if they have received more than £5000 in the previous 12 months.
- 9) Charities that are able to help RAG in their work such as by providing prizes, promotional material or expertise and training will be favoured.
- 10) The impact of receiving funds from Oxford RAG will be considered, with charities that will benefit most from Oxford RAG being favoured.
- 11) How the charity has used funding from Oxford RAG and other RAG societies will be considered. In terms of number of people benefited, and short and long-term impact.
- 12) Charities which have received multiple nominations in one year will be favoured.

13) In accordance with The Charities Review Council, which recommends that charities spend no more than 30% of their revenues on administration, charities that spend less than 30% of their revenues on administration will be favoured.

14) RAG cannot support individuals or organisations that exist solely to further religious or political beliefs. However community projects supported by religious organisations may be eligible, for instance a church hall that also houses community groups; check with us if you are unsure.

1. The short list of nominated charities will be published in a full page of the Oxford Student.

2. Polling shall take place from 8am Wednesday - 6pm Thursday of 6<sup>th</sup> Week except where there is a statutory by-election, in which case both elections shall run simultaneously.

3. The procedure for lodging complaints shall be the same as that outlined in Section C of the OUSU Standing Orders

#### **Activism and Campaigning**

1. Any member of OUSU is permitted to formally campaign on behalf of one shortlisted charity, excluding hustling for a favoured charity.

2. Members of OUSU are free to express their opinion as to preferred charities.

3. Violation of these regulations may result in a nominated charity being removed from the ballot at the discretion of elections committee.

# **Safety Bus Review**

## **Trinity Term 2012**

### **Contents**

- 1. Executive Summary**
- 2. Introduction**
- 3. The Safety Bus Survey**
  - i. Safety Bus Survey Summary**
  - ii. Common Room Visits Summary**
  - iii. Detailed Results**
  - iv. Summary of Recommendations**
- 4. The Focus Group**
- 5. Other Student Unions**
  - i. The Women's Minibus**
  - ii. Leicester SU's Safety Bus**
  - iii. The Durham Night Bus**
- 6. Options Moving Forward**
  - i. Maintain the status quo**
  - ii. Alter our partnership**
  - iii. Oxford University-only Safety Bus**
  - iv. Taxi Partnership**
  - v. Abandon the Safety Bus concept**
- 7. Preferred Option**
- 8. Publicity Plan**
- 9. Summary of Recommendations**

# 1. Executive Summary

This review is the end result of a three-stage process running throughout Hilary Term 2012.

In the first stage students were invited to share their experiences of using the Safety Bus via an online survey and by a series of Common Room visits. There was almost unanimous agreement that the Safety Bus provided a valuable and well-needed service for Oxford University students, but that often the delivery of the Safety Bus failed to match up to its ideals. Problems were identified in terms of general knowledge and awareness of the Safety Bus, and it was agreed that at a minimum requirement was that the Safety Bus run during Oxford University term times.

The second stage was a small focus group with a representative group of students including representatives from the OUSU Women's Campaign and the postgraduate community. The aim of this group was to evaluate the purpose of the Safety Bus and whether this purpose was being met by current arrangements. The welfare aspect of the Safety Bus was agreed as being its primary purpose and a number of ideas were floated as to how this purpose could be achieved more effectively and at a lower cost.

In the third stage, these ideas were investigated more thoroughly via interviews with possible service providers, correspondence with other Student Unions and conversations with partners. This investigation has provided us with five options to choose between as we consider the future of the Safety Bus:

**Option 1. Maintain the status quo:** We could keep the Safety Bus functioning as it currently does but with the condition that every effort is made to allow the Safety Bus to run during the duration of Oxford University term times and in a more efficient manner.

**Option 2. Alter our partnership:** We would keep the partnership with Oxford Brookes University but would contract out the running of the Safety Bus to an external provider.

**Option 3. Oxford University-only Safety Bus:** We could consider funding and managing a Safety Bus independent of Oxford Brookes University.

**Option 4. Taxi Partnership:** We could consider working with a local taxi company to offer free transport to vulnerable students.

**Option 5. Abandon the Safety Bus concept:** We could offer alternatives such as 'Walk safe schemes' or leave the provision of transportation to individual colleges.

For reasons that I shall explain throughout this report, **my preferred Option is Option 2** as it guarantees a level of service to meet the needs of students of both Universities.

Along with this preferred option I have outlined a number of recommendations for improving the service provided by the Safety Bus in its current form, and have included a draft publicity plan to raise awareness of the Safety Bus in the years to come.

A motion will be brought before OUSU Council in 3<sup>rd</sup> Week of Trinity Term to recommending Option 2 for approval and further investigation.

In the meantime please email [community@ousu.org](mailto:community@ousu.org) if you wish to comment on anything written in the report.

Daniel Stone  
Vice President (Charities and Community)

## 2. Introduction

The Oxford Student Safety Bus is run jointly by Oxford Brookes Student Union (OBSU) and the Oxford University Student Union as a means of transporting students safely to their homes late at night. The Safety Bus is a demand-responsive service, which means that pick-ups have to be called in using the Safety Bus number (0771 444 50 50), where priority is given to lone travellers and vulnerable students. Passengers are asked to give a voluntary donation of £1 for a service that will take them anywhere within the ring road.

The Safety Bus runs according to Oxford Brookes University term times, from 9pm-3am Monday to Saturday and from 9pm-1am on Sundays. Operation of the Safety Bus is dependent on a committed group of volunteer drivers and co-drivers, as well as the OBSU Membership Services Administrator who is responsible for upkeep of the Safety Buses. There are currently two buses kept and maintained at the Oxford Brookes Headington Hill Campus. Both buses will be used on traditionally busy nights, provided that there are enough volunteers on shift.

In the 2011/12 academic year OUSU will contribute £12,000 to the running of the Safety Bus, while OBSU will more than match this sum, bringing the overall figure of running the two buses beyond £25,000. It is worth noting that OUSU receives money from the University to fund the Safety Bus and there is no evidence that we would be able to hold onto any savings made from providing the service at lower cost.

The review process was set in motion by OBSU and OUSU in October 2011 as an attempt to evaluate current service provision. A few weeks later in 7<sup>th</sup> Week Council of Michaelmas Term 2011 a motion was passed mandating the Vice President (Women) and Vice President (Charities and Community) to:

1. Evaluate and consider ways to increase and improve upon current efforts to promote usage of the 'Safety Bus'
2. Evaluate current usage of the safety bus
3. Ensure the continuation of the service throughout the evaluation/investigation

This review is in response to both the process begun by the Student Unions and the issues highlighted in the OUSU Council motion. It will begin by presenting the results of the Safety Bus Survey, Focus Group and Student Union investigations, before using these results to suggest options moving forward for the operation and promotion of the Safety Bus. The review concludes with a brief summary of recommendations scattered throughout this report.

### 3. The Safety Bus Survey

These are the results and subsequent analysis of the Safety Bus Survey conducted during Hilary Term 2012. In total 450 students from the University of Oxford participated in this investigation through the completion of an online survey or by show of hands in a Common Room general meeting.

The information generated from the survey and common rooms have been purposefully separated to account for statistical bias. Survey respondents had to opt-in to the Safety Bus survey and are consequently likely to be more knowledgeable about the safety bus than the average student. However attendees at a random common room general meeting could provide a useful unbiased cross-section of the student body (although it could be argued that students who attend GMs are likely to be more knowledgeable too).

A brief summary of the findings from the Safety Bus Survey and the data from Common Room visits are given below, along with a more detailed breakdown of results.

#### i. Safety Bus Survey Summary

General usage of the Safety Bus among Oxford University students is quite low due to the central location of colleges, the existence of other alternatives and a general lack of knowledge about the Safety Bus and when it operates. Usage is not helped by the perception that the Safety Bus is exclusively for vulnerable students and a number of bad experiences of students calling the Safety Bus.

Some of these issues are linked to a lack of publicity and awareness, but further publicity could actually exacerbate problems if the Safety Bus continues to run only according to Oxford Brookes University term times and if certain inefficiencies are not successfully ironed out.

There was almost unanimous agreement that the Safety Bus provided a valuable and well-needed service for Oxford University students, but that often the delivery of the Safety Bus failed to match up to its ideals.

#### ii. Common Room Visits Summary

General awareness of the Safety Bus was quite high (90%), but usage was much lower. Perceptions of the Safety Bus and knowledge of the workings of the Safety Bus were quite poor, but there was a consensus that the Safety Bus had to at the very least run according to both Oxford Brookes and Oxford University Term times.

#### iii. Safety Bus Survey Detailed Results

Q1. Name

Q2. Gender:

Gender		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Male	35.0%	76
Female	64.1%	139
Other	0.9%	2
<i>answered question</i>		<b>217</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>4</b>

Q3. College: Students from 36 Colleges and PPHs participated in the survey, with the greatest number of responses from Balliol (32), Corpus Christi (15) and Linacre/St Hugh's (11)

#### Q4. Undergraduate/Postgraduate

Undergraduate/Postgraduate		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Undergraduate	79.2%	175
Postgraduate	20.4%	45
Other	0.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>		221
<i>skipped question</i>		0

#### Q5. Year of Study

Year of Study		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1	30.3%	67
2	30.8%	68
3	25.3%	56
4	10.4%	23
5	2.3%	5
6	0.5%	1
6+	0.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>		221
<i>skipped question</i>		0

#### Q6. Safety Bus Usage

How often do you use the Safety Bus?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Never	70.6%	139
I used it once but haven't used it since (jump to Q8)	19.8%	39
Occasionally (jump to Q9)	9.1%	18
Regularly (jump to Q9)	1.5%	3
Other (please specify)		2
<i>answered question</i>		197
<i>skipped question</i>		24

There were two responses of people who have tried the Safety Bus number and couldn't get through or found it wasn't running

#### Q7. Why have you never used the Safety Bus?

The responses collected for this question can be broadly divided into:

1. No need for the Safety Bus (79) - Respondents didn't stay out that late or their college is quite central or they felt that there were **better alternatives** such as public transport, bikes, walking with a panic alarm or using existing college taxi services that reimburse women walking home alone at night
2. Lack of information (31) - Respondents **didn't know it existed and/or where/how to catch it**
3. Perceived inconvenience (11): There was a **perception that the Safety Bus would take too long to arrive** and so getting a taxi was easier

4. Altruism (9): Respondents didn't want to take the service away from someone in greater need. Suggestion that **the word 'Safety' meant that people were reluctant to use it**
5. Perceptions of Safety Bus (8): Linked to 1 and 4, it was perceived that the Safety Bus was for drunken people or only in the case of an emergency. Therefore people were embarrassed to use it.
6. Bad Experiences (8): These ranged from calls not connecting (2), to people having to wait too long for the bus to arrive (3), to really poor service from 'rude' volunteers (3). One suggestion was that rather than ringing out, **the Voicemail on the Safety Bus phone** could be used to communicate more effectively to passengers of the safety bus isn't running that night etc. These negative experiences were extremely damaging to the reputation of the Safety Bus within these common rooms and affected the willingness of students to use it.
7. Forgot it existed (3)

Q8. Why do you no longer use the Safety Bus?

The responses fell broadly into four categories:

1. Bad Experiences (23): Further divided into
  - a. Not running when needed (12): This is primarily because the bus only runs according to **Brookes Term times** so people were calling and not getting through
  - b. Slow service (7): **Took far too long**
  - c. Rude volunteers (3): Talk down to passengers as volunteers assume they're drunk; **volunteers can act predatorily (asking female volunteers for their phone number)**
  - d. Someone wasn't picked up (1)
2. No need (20): The Safety Bus was used as a one off in an emergency situation or during **freshers' week**
3. Change in situation so they live much closer to town (3)
4. Plans to use bus again (2)

Q9. Average waiting times

If you have used the Safety Bus, what is the average amount of time you have waited to be picked up?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Less than 5 minutes	5.7%	3
5-10 minutes	26.4%	14
10-15 minutes	32.1%	17
15-20 minutes	24.5%	13
20+ minutes	13.2%	7
Other (please specify)		6
<b>answered question</b>		<b>53</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>168</b>

Two answers in the 'other' category were 45mins-1hr and more than an hour

Q.10 Do you know the Safety Bus number?

Do you know the number to call the Safety Bus?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
No	55.8%	110
Yes, I keep it in my phone	43.1%	85
Yes, I keep it on my person (wallet etc.)	2.5%	5
Yes, I've memorised it	0.5%	1
Other (please specify)		4
<b>answered question</b>		<b>197</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>24</b>

Q.11 When does the Safety Bus run?

When does the Safety Bus run?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
All year round	4.1%	8
According to Oxford Brookes term times	18.8%	37
According to Oxford University term times	10.7%	21
I don't know	71.6%	141
Other (please specify)		1
<b>answered question</b>		<b>197</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>24</b>

The correct answer is 'according to Oxford Brookes term times'

Q.12 When should the Safety Bus run?

When should the Safety Bus run?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
All year round	17.3%	34
During Oxford Brookes term times only	1.0%	2
During Oxford University term times only	3.6%	7
During both Oxford Brookes and Oxford University term times	73.1%	144
I don't know	6.1%	12
Other (please specify)		2
<b>answered question</b>		<b>197</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>24</b>

The two 'other' suggestions were to run it during the vacation to account for postgraduates and to put the service on hold until adjustments are made to make it function properly

Q.13 Would you consider volunteering for the Safety Bus?

Would you consider volunteering for the Safety Bus?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	23.8%	45
No	56.1%	106
I don't know	21.7%	41
<b>answered question</b>		<b>189</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>32</b>

Q.14 Would you recommend the Safety Bus to a new student?

Would you recommend the Safety Bus to a new student?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.5%	131
No	8.6%	17
I don't know	24.9%	49
Why/Why not?		82
<b>answered question</b>		<b>197</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>24</b>

Out of those who answered yes:

1. 29 thought it was a really good service as it is safe, cheap and a good alternative
2. 22 non-users would recommend it as it seemed like a good idea

Out of those who answered no/I don't know:

1. 15 said they couldn't recommend a service they hadn't used and didn't know much about
2. 9 thought it was unreliable and too slow
3. 5 had a particularly bad experience using the safety bus
4. 1 said they were afraid of going on a bus full of drunk people
5. One recommendation was that it is **dangerous to advertise an unreliable service**. This respondent was left stranded far from home with £1 in their pocket.

Q.15 What would you say is the best aspect of the Safety Bus?

The responses were:

1. Price (47): The optional £1 fee was low enough not to put people off from using the bus
2. Safety (23): People felt safe on the Safety Bus and could trust volunteers more than taxi drivers (3)
3. Convenience (15): The fact that it ran at night throughout Oxford and took you to your door
4. The Idea (11): Knowing that it's there as an option even if idea has been executed poorly
5. Prioritising (8): The fact that 'vulnerable' people are given priority
6. Friendly volunteers (6)
7. Non-judgemental (1)

Q.16 Is there anything that could be done differently?

The responses were:

1. A quicker service (14): It takes too long and the expected length of time isn't always accurately communicated
2. Publicity (14): People aren't aware of the Safety Bus and the number. Why not **distribute the card to lodges?**
3. Purpose (8): Make the purpose clear - **is it only for 'vulnerable' students or not?** Show it's non-judgemental
4. Consistency/reliability (7): Doesn't run when advertised
5. Volunteers (3): Need better **training on being non-confrontational, friendlier and should aim to have at least one female volunteer**
6. More buses (3)
7. Longer running hours (2)
8. Use in the day for charity groups to increase visibility (2)
9. Waste of time, money and effort. It's the responsibility of students to plan ahead (1)

## Common Room Visits Detailed Results

The combined results from the 7 Common Rooms visited in Hilary Term 2012 are as follows:

Total number of students: 229

1. Have they heard of the Safety Bus?  
Yes - 205 (90%); No - 24 (10%)
2. Have they used the Safety Bus (out of 205)  
Yes - 25 (12%); No - 180 (88%)
3. Do you have the Safety Bus number to hand? (out of 205)  
Phone - 51 (25%); wallet/equivalent - 8 (4%); elsewhere - 8 (4%); don't know - 138 (67%)
4. When does the Safety Bus run? (out of 205)  
All year - 0; Brookes - 74 (36%); OU - 47 (23%); Both - 15 (7%); Don't Know - 69 (34%)
5. When should it run?  
All year - 12 (5%); Brookes - 0; OU only - 0; Both term times - 207 (90%)
6. Would you consider volunteering for the Safety Bus?  
Yes - 36 (16%); No - 193 (84%)

### iv. Summary of Recommendations

The Safety Bus Survey brought out a number of key recommendations:

1. The Safety Bus has to run during Oxford University term times: frustrations were exacerbated because the service wasn't running when expected.
2. The Safety Bus has to run quickly and more reliably: the relatively close proximity of Oxford Colleges and places of residence, means that there are often more viable alternatives.
3. Promotion has to become more effective: People didn't know enough about the Safety Bus - one suggestion was to leave Safety Bus cards in College lodges. An important point was that we should only heavily promote a service that we know is functioning well or else we could put students in danger.
4. Publicity should also make it clear whom the Safety Bus is for. This could potentially lead to changing the name from 'Safety' as it was felt that this name conjured up unhelpful associations and made people reluctant to use it.
5. Use Voicemail on the Safety Bus phone to pass on information rather than allowing it to ring out.
6. Volunteer Training: Training should re-emphasise the importance of being non-confrontational. There was also a concerning account of a volunteer acting predatorily, which should also be addressed in upcoming volunteer training. It was suggested that having at least one female volunteer could make female passengers more comfortable.

## 4. The Focus Group

The focus group was brought together to offer a cross-sectional response to some of the fundamental questions behind the function of Safety Bus, how it is publicised and what an improved service would look like. The focus group was conducted without knowledge of the results of the Safety Bus survey.

An open invitation was sent out to Womens' Officers, OUSU Representatives, Welfare Representatives and Common Room Presidents, in the hope that we'd be able to get together a representative group of students from the undergraduate and postgraduate community. The end result was a group of 5 students and sabbatical officers broadly covering these interest groups.

Our first discussion was on the purpose of the Safety Bus. It was agreed that its primary purpose was the **welfare service it provided to vulnerable students**, both directly and indirectly, as it prevented the use of potentially harmful alternatives. Other fringe benefits included the impact of the Safety Bus in maintaining positive relationships with the police and local community.

We concluded that the primary purpose was best fulfilled through **low prices, a reliable and quick service, and trust in the Safety Bus brand**. It was felt that the current price level was good, but that service was often unreliable and slow, and the Safety Bus brand was being let down by a general lack of awareness and publicity.

The unreliability of the service was apportioned to the fact that it didn't run during a large part of the Oxford University academic year and sometimes didn't run when advertised, usually if there were not enough willing volunteers. However there were also irregularities based on the distance between the Safety Bus and the passenger at the time the call was made. It was felt that this was primarily due to the greater distance of Oxford Brookes University campuses and halls of residence from the city centre. The inability to respond quickly to the needs of vulnerable students was deemed to be unacceptable given the purpose of the Safety Bus.

The discussion on publicity produced a number of useful recommendations:

- Publicity should target friends and give them the responsibility of getting their friends home safely. Often an individual will be too drunk to make the rational decision of calling the Safety Bus.
- We should consider changing the name of the Safety Bus as there is stigma attached to the word 'safety'. Other SUs have a 'Night Bus' while Sheffield has a 'Women's Minibus'.
- Publicity should involve: putting safety bus cards in lodges, bars and common rooms, use of facebook and YouTube, targeting Entz Reps and freshers' week, and putting posters in undergraduate and graduate accommodation a considerable distance away from the city centre.

In closing we discussed how the welfare service of the Safety Bus could more effectively and/or efficiently be provided by other means. This discussion spawned the investigation at the heart of the next three chapters.

## 5. Other Student Unions

Many other Student Unions run a ‘safety’ bus with varied levels of success. In the vast majority of cases the bus has a series of set pick-up times from outside the Student Union building or other popular destinations in town. Most Student Unions also give **details of a preferred taxi company** should the bus reach capacity.

The Oxford context is very different in that OUSU doesn’t have a central venue and the Brookes central venue is situated outside of the city centre and no longer runs student club nights. Unlike the Oxford Student Safety Bus, the service offered by other Unions has limited capacity to respond to emergency situations, as there is very little in place to reach students away from the Student Union building who needed immediate assistance.

Out of the many examples, three case studies from other Student Unions have been selected as illustrations of the way in which the Safety Bus functions elsewhere:

### i. The Women’s Minibus

The Sheffield University Student Union runs a Women’s Minibus 7-nights a week during term time, taking women to their doors from outside the Student Union building. Tickets cost £1.50 each and can be bought either by purchasing them from the Student Union earlier in the day or by turning up at the fixed pick-up time. The pick-up time is on the half hour every hour between 9.30pm and 2.30am. It is estimated to cost around £10,000 per year.

The minibus works because most students will go to the club nights hosted by the SU, so the pick-up spot is an ideal location for clubbers and people working late in the library just around the corner. The women passengers really appreciate the service provided, as they don’t have the same level of trust and security catching a taxi home. There is often backlash from men who would like to use the service too, but more than thirty years on, it is still a women’s only bus.

Sheffield University Student Union also runs a ‘Safety Taxi’ scheme in partnership with Sheffield Hallam University Student Union, the City Council and a local taxi company. Under the terms of their agreement a lone or vulnerable student can hand over a card and receive free transportation back home, therefore responding to the needs of students in an emergency.

### ii. Leicester SU’s Safety Bus

Leicester three Safety Buses take students home on a daily basis throughout term time from 6pm in the winter and 7pm in the summer. Pick-ups are every half hour, from outside the Student Union or the venue of the most popular student club night (after midnight). It costs £2 per trip home or students can purchase a termly or annual Safety Bus Pass, worth £39 and £79 respectively. This year 16 termly and 196 annual passes have been sold.

The buses operate at a deficit of around £45,000 per year to run as they’re driven and operated by paid staff members. However they are able to claw back some of this deficit by hiring out the minibuses to sports clubs and societies.

### iii. The Durham Night Bus

The Durham Night bus operates in an almost identical fashion to the Oxford Student Safety Bus. For a fee of £1 the bus responds on demand to students calling the Night bus number, with priority given to lone travellers. The bus transports an estimated 10,000 students per year despite only using one vehicle.

However the big difference is that the Night Bus is contracted out to external providers. Under their agreement the contractor keeps the £1 fee and charges the Student Union an additional fixed amount per week. Durham estimates that it costs them around £10,00 per year to offer a service that is fully staffed and maintained by an external company.

The bus also has a different image to the Safety Bus. At the start of a night out it is viewed as a “Party bus” to take students from colleges into town. Its welfare function of providing a safe and secure way back

home takes priority after a night out. This has been found to be an extremely productive way of getting students comfortable with the idea of calling and using the Safety Bus.

## 6. Options Moving Forward

The responses to the Safety Bus Survey, the opinions expressed in the focus group and the results of investigations into similar schemes have convinced me that there are five options to choose between as we face the future of the Safety Bus. In this section I will outline the five options and their relative strengths and weaknesses, then in the following section I will select the option I believe to be the preferable option of the five.

The five options are:

- i. Maintain the status quo
- ii. Alter our partnership
- iii. Oxford University-only Safety Bus
- iv. Taxi Partnership
- v. Abandon the Safety Bus concept

### I. Maintain the Status Quo

**We could keep the Safety Bus functioning as it currently does but with the condition that every effort is made to allow the Safety Bus to run during the duration of Oxford University term times and in a more efficient manner.**

The Safety Bus has a system that transports the majority of callers safely to their desired destination. Some would say 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it'. However I think it is broken.

It is broken primarily because for the majority of Trinity Term and the beginning of Hilary Term this vital welfare service isn't available to students at the University of Oxford, despite the hefty sum paid by the Student Union. This HAS to change. The question then becomes how can we keep the Safety Bus running outside of Brookes term times given that the majority of volunteers and all the support staff are members of Oxford Brookes University?

Even if this question has an easy answer, I think the case studies from other Student Unions have shown that the Safety Bus isn't operating as efficiently as it could. Using a central student union venue clearly isn't feasible, but we should investigate the possibility of following Leicester's model of having fixed pick-up times outside popular venues.

### II. Alter our partnership

**We would keep the partnership with Oxford Brookes University but would contract out the running of the Safety Bus to an external provider.**

In answer to the question posed under the previous heading, I think the only way to guarantee a reliable, consistent service running through both Oxford Brookes and Oxford University term times is to contract out the running of the Safety Bus.

Durham University Student Union have shown that this model makes financial sense as the economies of scale and scope afforded to professional coach companies allows them to provide a much cheaper service inclusive of staffing and maintenance costs. Contracting out also avoids the problems of volunteer shortages during the exam period and other times of student inactivity.

Conversely, contracting out will rob the service of student volunteers. Although the Safety Bus Survey unearthed grievances with student volunteers, many more commented that the volunteers contributed to a friendly and enjoyable journey, and that they were able to trust student volunteers more. As well as the effect on the service user there is also a negative effect on individual volunteers who lose the opportunity to contribute to a service they care about.

### III. Oxford University-only Safety Bus

**We could consider funding and managing a Safety Bus independent of Oxford Brookes University.**

This would seek primarily to address concerns voiced about the speed of the service. Having an Oxford University-only Safety Bus would greatly reduce the average length of journeys and would consequently reduce average waiting times.

I'd question whether there would be enough demand among Oxford University students given the close proximity of colleges to the city centre. Usage among Brookes students is much greater than that of Oxford University students and it could be more efficient to pool our resources into a single service. However owning our own bus could allow us to create demand in new ways by working with volunteering groups or societies.

If we chose to go it alone, we would be faced with the prospect of sourcing our own volunteers and finding somewhere to keep the Safety Bus, although outsourcing could solve both of these problems. The latter problem could also be remedied by exploring the possibilities of working in partnership with the Oxford University Sports Federation or local minibus owners, but this is unlikely to be able to provide a reliable and cost-effective service.

### IV. Taxi Partnership

**We could consider working with a local taxi company to offer free transport to vulnerable students.**

Sheffield University Student Union has both a bus scheme and a 'safe taxi' scheme, so the two are not mutually exclusive. However I would see a taxi scheme as an addition to a good safety bus scheme.

Feedback suggests that the Safety Bus works because students trust it, whereas they wouldn't be as quick to use a taxi if they were alone at night. Taxis are also unlikely to want to take home students on the verge of vomiting, when the majority of emergency cases attended to by the Safety Bus will involve students in an intoxicated state.

However taxis are both reliable and quick. It is undesirable for a student who is feeling unsafe to be told to wait for a considerable amount of time (if they're able to get through to a Safety Bus in the first place). Taxis would offer a speedy solution and the firm we have a partnership with could be adorned with Student Union branding to make them easily identifiable.

### V. Abandon the Safety Bus concept

**We could offer alternatives such as 'Walk safe schemes' or leave the provision of transportation to individual colleges.**

This option isn't desirable or efficient, but has been included in the review for the sake of completeness. There was almost unanimous agreement from everyone involved in the review that the Safety Bus provided a valuable and necessary welfare service for students in a vulnerable position.

Walk safe schemes are meaningless for a student too intoxicated to stand and for individual students who for whatever reason find themselves alone. And it simply wouldn't be feasible for colleges to provide anything on the scale of the Safety Bus. A few colleges have a taxi partnership scheme in full operation, so it is perhaps worth encouraging other colleges to do the same.

I don't think college taxi schemes will eradicate the need for a centralised Safety Bus, but would add to our collective welfare provision to ensure that vulnerable students are looked after.

## 7. Preferred Option

Using the results of the survey and the focus group it has been possible to derive a list of criteria that service users would like to find in the Safety Bus. I have measured these criteria against how likely they are to be achieved within each of these options where:

- 1 = very unlikely
- 2 = unlikely
- 3 = difficult to say
- 4 = likely
- 5 = very likely

I have taken Option 5 out of consideration because none of the criteria are applicable to a non-existent service and have added brackets to Option 3 to take account of outsourcing an Oxford-only Safety Bus.

The results confirm my preferred option as **Option 2: Altering our partnership with Oxford Brookes University and outsourcing the running of the Safety Bus.**

	Maintain	Outsource	Oxford-only (If outsourced)	Taxi
Likelihood of running for duration of Oxford term	3	5	5 (5)	5
Providing a Quick Service	3	3	4 (4)	4
Providing a Reliable Service	3	5	2 (5)	5
Ease of Promotion and Messaging	4	4	4 (4)	2
Strength of Safety Bus Brand	4	4	4 (4)	2
Demand from students	4	4	3 (3)	4
Low cost to passengers	5	5	5 (5)	5
Feasibility	5	4	3 (3)	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>30 (33)</b>	<b>31</b>

As of yet, the cost of pursuing option 2 is unknown but the evidence from other Student Unions suggests that it will be significantly less than the amount we currently spend. A desirable agreement for contracting out the Safety Bus could be an outlay of £300 per week split between the two Student Unions plus the £1 passenger fee payable to the company, in return for a fully staffed Safety Bus running according to a mixture of scheduled stops on major student club nights and a demand-responsive service.

As mentioned earlier, the major drawback of Option 2 is the effect on student volunteers. I can assure you that I have not treated this matter lightly, but I believe that outsourcing is the only way to guarantee a basic standard of service for both Universities. The Safety Bus is primarily a welfare service and we never want to be in a situation where the needs of a vulnerable student are left unmet.

## 8. Publicity Plan

Regardless of what option we choose moving forward it essential that the Safety Bus is promoted effectively. The following Publicity Plan outlines the current strategy for publicising use of the Safety Bus among the Oxford University student population and includes suggestions drawn out during this review. Broader issues of Safety Bus usage are identified and marketing suggestions are given.

This is by no means a perfect plan and future Vice Presidents (Charities and Community) should seek to amend it as new opportunities present themselves. Note that under the current contract OBSU is obliged to provide OUSU with 5000 flyers and 150 posters upon reasonable request.

Time	Details	Publicity Used	Suggestions
Long Vacation	<p>Entz Reps, Welfare Reps and Common Room Committees will be in the process of planning freshers' week.</p> <p>This is an ideal opportunity to advertise the Safety Bus as a means of getting people home after a house party/night out.</p>	<p>Email via entzlist, welfare reps' list reminding people of the service offered by Safety Bus.</p>	<p>Get Presidents to 'push' it to their reps/freshers' week committees by sending an email via Preslist and MCR PresCom.</p> <p>Be more proactive in facilitating relationship. Get reps to email you what night they're planning to go out, where and with how many people. They will still have to ring on the night, but being proactive may make them more likely to do so.</p> <p>Get feedback from reps who have used the service.</p>
Freshers' Week	<p>People will be arriving in Oxford and/or 'living out' in Oxford for the first time. Many of these people will be unfamiliar with the Safety Bus.</p> <p>The freshers' fair provides a perfect opportunity to introduce people to the Safety Bus as do induction talks.</p>	<p>Safety Bus cards handed out during freshers' fair on the OUSU stall.</p> <p>Safety Bus number read out during International Students' induction talk and on visits to Common Rooms.</p> <p>Facebook Group and YouTube clip.</p>	<p>OUSU isn't invited to all Common Rooms and when they are, time is limited. Welfare Reps should be emailed beforehand and asked to include the Safety Bus as part of their induction talks.</p> <p>Talks will be even more interesting if punctuated by a video clip and efforts should be made to use facebook and other forms of online marketing tools.</p>
On-going from freshers' week	<p>The publicity strategy should seek to target those groups who are most likely to use the bus - namely the population 'living out' or living in college/university owned property a suitable distance away from the centre of town.</p> <p>These groups are notoriously quite difficult to reach but the Student Community</p>	<p>All Common Room welfare reps, entz officers and later, OUSU reps and Common Room Presidents, emailed to ask if they require posters. Posters then distributed on request.</p> <p>Safety Bus cards in</p>	<p>Direct strategy towards colleges further away from the City Centre.</p> <p>Use Student Community Wardens to distribute safety bus cards.</p> <p>Include the Safety Bus poster in the Oxford Student at least twice a term.</p> <p>Distribute posters to college or university owned</p>

	<p>Warden and Head Residents Schemes could offer a mechanism for effective communication. Certain colleges such as St Hugh's and St Hilda's may also be more amenable to the Safety Bus.</p> <p>Publicity should target friends and put the onus on them to get their friends home safely after a night out, using the Safety Bus.</p>	<p>lodges, Common Rooms and college bars.</p> <p>New poster design and/or video targeting friends.</p>	<p>accommodation buildings via Head Residents or college reps.</p>
On-going from freshers' week	<p>It will be important to maintain productive relationships with clubs, the police and external venues. In appropriate situations these external parties should see the Safety Bus as a partner in helping to manage the night-time economy.</p>	<p>Distribution of Safety Bus cards and number to door staff and police.</p>	<p>Maintain communication with external stakeholders.</p>
Volunteer Drives	<p>It may be necessary to make a concerted effort to attract volunteers for the Safety Bus. Drives should begin with but not be limited to current Safety Bus users.</p>	<p>Publicise through Oxford Hub, the Oxford Student Newspaper and relevant mail lists</p>	<p>Devise a way for regular users to be approached to fill volunteering opportunities. Streamline volunteer training process.</p>
On-going from freshers' week	<p>It will be necessary to continually evaluate usage of the Safety Bus while maintaining a flow of communication with users and Common Room reps.</p>	<p>Email to reps.</p>	<p>Offer more posters, reminder of complaints procedure and offer to visit Common Room to talk about safety bus.</p> <p>Consider sending an email at the start/end of each term to keep the Safety Bus fresh in the minds of reps.</p>
Trinity Term	<p>Constant evaluation will be necessary to ensure the efficient running of the Safety Bus. If done correctly the evaluation can also boost awareness and participation.</p>	<p>Safety Bus Review to be conducted over HT/TT 2012, using surveys and forums.</p>	<p>An annual review of the Safety Bus is to be encouraged through the use of surveys etc.</p>

## 9. Summary of Recommendations

The Safety Bus provides a valuable welfare service for the students of Oxford Brookes University and the University of Oxford. In summary, the recommendations I have made for improving the service are:

1. The Safety Bus has to run during Oxford University term times. This is a minimum requirement for a welfare service designed to serve Oxford University students. I believe that this will be achieved most effectively by outsourcing provision of the Safety Bus.
2. The Safety Bus has to run quickly and more reliably. This was a clear message from the survey and focus group. I think we should explore the possibilities of having scheduled stops outside popular venues while maintaining the requirement for people to call or book in advance.
3. Promotion has to become more effective. I take responsibility for the shortcomings in this area and have written a publicity plan for future years.
4. Use of Voicemail on the Safety Bus phone to pass on information rather than allowing it to ring out.
5. Volunteer Training should re-emphasise the importance of being non-confrontational and professional in service.
6. Both Student Unions should explore the possibility of starting a partnership with a local taxi company and should at the very least give details of a preferred taxi company for students travelling home at night.

In conclusion I would like to thank everyone who contributed to this review either through completing the survey, taking part in the focus group or attending your common room general meeting.

I hope this review has captured your thoughts and concerns as we together we seek to improve your time here in Oxford.

Daniel Stone  
Oxford University Student Union  
Vice President (Charities and Community)