

# OUSU council minutes

**3<sup>rd</sup> week Council held at 5.30pm on Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> February in the Moser Lecture Theatre, Wadham College.  
Sign in from 5.15pm**

- 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**

Chair points out the new system for printing of council agenda's and minutes. Advising that full copies of agenda's will be printed but that if people wish to amend anything on the minutes or discuss the reports they should bring their own, although there will be five copies available. He advises that this is to reduce paper wastage and financial wastage.

Minutes passed

Matters arising none

---

## **d. Elections in Council**

Ronnie Collinson (RO)

Advises that nominations for VP Graduates opening tomorrow at midday and closing midday next Thursday.

Mae Penner has nominated for Rules Committee. But I ask for any further nominations.

Daniel Lowe also nominates in the undergraduate category. Meeting very soon.

Sarah Hutchinson advises what Rules Committee is.

Nomination for Graduate Category Nishma Doshi

### **Election for 4 members of the OUSU Scrutiny Committee.**

The Scrutiny Committee is responsible for scrutinising the work of the OUSU Executive in line with the OUSU Standing Orders. Any member of OUSU is eligible to run – email [president@ousu.org](mailto:president@ousu.org) for more information.

Mark Brakel (Lincoln) and Daniel Stone (St Peters)

The Returning Officer asks the standard questions:

Mark Brakel (Lincoln):

No. On the mailing list of Conservatives, Liberal Democrats, Labour and the Dutch Liberal Democrats.

I am a 1<sup>st</sup> yr PPE student at Lincoln. I was President of School Student Union in Netherlands, which is a massive organisation and I hope the experience can be useful to OUSU. Was also the President of the Youth Organisation. Saw article in Cherwell about the financial situation of OUSU and would like to monitor OUSU on this.

Daniel Stone (St Peters):

No, Labour party and OULC.

Looking to give something back to my student union, this position appeals to me. Haven't read standing orders yet but important to scrutinise against their manifestos and use our common sense so would be down to committee to see that everything is done in the best interests of the students. Need to work out how to get the best out of resources and individuals.

Questions:

If you found that someone wasn't up to scratch do you have any problems standing up to Council and saying that.

Both answer No.

No further questions.

#### **4 members of the University Rules Committee.**

The University Rules Committee considers changes to certain University regulations about students. 2 members must be graduate students, 2 places are reserved for students who have been matriculated for at least 3 terms.

Mae Penner and Daniel Lowe.

Mae Penner (Magdalen):

No and No

Daniel Lowe (St Edmund's):

Not yet. Amnesty International and People and Planet.

Mae Penner (Magdalen):

I am 2<sup>nd</sup> yr Modern Linguist. Think really important committee important to keep dialogue between University and Students. Have experience of committees and reliable and attend committees.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds):

Would like to be on, good because as I have lots of experience dealing with the Proctors, in a non disciplinary fashion.

Question:

Is there a particular rule you would get rid of or change?

Mae Penner (Magdalen):

Would listen to what students think and do what is in the best interest of the students.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds):

Would like to see harassment rules more severely imposed in common room meetings. Would like to see community service punishments imposed rather than monetary, as this is a more effective form of punishment and more equal

Question:

What would you replace Proctorial fines with?

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds):

Wouldn't get rid of entirely but would replace some with community service punishments. Supervised volunteering within the community. When comes to trashing should be made to clear it up.

Mae Penner (Magdalen):

Shift it away from fines and have a more positive response to this. Would be better to have culture where people give back. Works well in colleges where it is already in place and think university should look into this.

Question:

Do you think it is likely that there would be a shift towards community service as if there is would this case a problem with supervision?

Mae Penner (Magdalen):

Are needs but if becomes established procedure then whole system would have to shift. Quite a large debate would have to go on but think students would be interested and it would be a debate worth happening.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds):

Have spoken to Proctors and Assessors and seem hesitant but not reluctant, it has been shown that it works on a college level, and also works on a national level, so think could work on a University level and students could get more involved in community.

Question:

Timing of fines, what do you think about this?

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds):

Think if in middle of a series of exams and can't wait till the end of your period of exams then fair, but they could have at least waited till until end of exam.

Mae Penner (Magdalen):

Think should discuss this and it shouldn't be difficult to change

Nishma Doshi (Linacre):

No, green Party

Graduates make up 40% of the student population and are hugely diverse and most only here for a year. Most don't know how Oxford works or the rules. Have also been to committees before.

Question:

Are there any particular rules you would like to see replaced?

Nishma Doshi (Linacre):

Hard to find and difficult to acknowledge so awareness should promote.

Would try to use the lists to push them forward to the common rooms. Or having on website accessible, part of front page. Posters

RO recaps on candidates.

## **Election Results**

### **Scrutiny Committee**

Daniel Stone and Mark Brakell took up places

### **Rules Committee**

Nisha Doshi elected to graduate position

Mae Penner and Daniel Lowe both elected to Rules Committee.

---

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

### **Stefan Baskerville - President**

Will keep it brief as funding taken up a lot of time already. Meeting with JCR Presidents on Friday and JCCSM coming up.

No questions.

### **Kat Wall - VP Women**

Very sorry no written report. Any questions get back to me last week taken up with many training sessions fully booked for whole term. If you would like training for next term then please email

Wellbeing week going very well. Come along to the event tonight at Angels.

### **Dani Quinn - VP Welfare & Equal Opportunities**

Lots of condoms to give away at the event tonight – come along it's going to be great!

### **Sarah Hutchinson - VP Graduates**

Having a post graduate drinks this week. Next week PGA, experimenting with different times to see which works best, this one is going to be held at lunchtime on Tuesday.

Some people have been told that their fees have been reset and they have not paid the right amount. Some colleges don't know they can appeal but they can and I can help them with this, so if you know anyone that this has been a problem for get them to get in touch with me.

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

University just confirmed date for Complaints and Appeals committee let me know if there is anything you want me to raise.

Eorann Lean - VP Charities & Community

Not able to attend as at the Beyond Profit Careers Event but email her if you would like to know anything about her report or what she is working on.

---

## **f. Reports from the Executive Officers wishing to give reports**

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

OUSU produces lots of publications, so just let me know if you would like any of them and I will send them out.

Common room visits still want to come and visit so let me know if your common room would like on.

I will be running another societies workshop in the next two week. So if anyone interested in setting up a society let them know,

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

Msets doing last push please get finalists to fill in. Marking criteria: working on students marking other students work. Please get in touch if you have ever had this happen and what you thought about it as it would be really useful for the report Jonny is writing on this.

### **Charlotte Carnegie – Rent and Accommodation Officer**

Rent pack on way, rewriting completely will be in common rooms soon.

## **Yuan Yang – Women’s Officer**

Women’s Campaign focussing on idea on sexuality, something happen which is open to all is a talk in 4<sup>th</sup> week which is a talk by Zoe Margolis, if you would like to attend please email me or look at the facebook event.

---

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

#### **1. OUSU Budget 2010 – 2011**

Passes Nem Con

#### **1. Urgent Challenges for OUSU and the University**

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

Proposes that this goes to the agenda in 5<sup>th</sup> week.

Speech in proposition.

We haven’t done enough consultation on this. One student turned up. MCR Presidents have had active discussion on MCR mail list. Passing this before every one has had time to consult on this. No pressing need.

Speech in opposition

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

I oppose this as it doesn’t take into account how the university makes decisions on how the student union functions. If information goes to University in Trinity then it is often too late for University decisions. They need to make a decision on how this is to happen. It’s really urgent, and if we want it to happen. We need them to start thinking about it. If we delay it just think it won’t happen.

Move to vote.

Chair advises that this will need 2/3 majority to pass.

Doesn’t pass stays on agenda.

Opposition

#### **2. Equal Access for Asylum Seekers**

Opposition

#### **3. Road Safety outside the King’s Arms**

Passes Nem Con

#### **4. Thirst Lodge’s Lapdancing Licence**

Opposition

---

### **i. The Budget or Amended Budget**

#### **1. OUSU Budget 2010 - 2011**

##### **Council Notes and Accepts**

1. The attached OUSU Budget 2010 – 2011.

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

Passed nem con.

---

## **n. Other Motions**

### **1. Urgent Challenges for OUSU and the University**

#### **Council notes:**

1. That OUSU, like other student unions in the UK, intends to register with the Charity Commission as a result of the changes made by the 2006 Charity Act.
2. That OUSU's planned date of registration is the 1st August 2010.
3. That OUSU is currently an unincorporated association, the trustees of which are liable for the activities of the organisation.
4. That OUSU plans to incorporate prior to registration with the Commission, because of the protection from liability that a company affords to the trustees of the student union.
5. That the process of incorporation involves adopting a Memorandum and Articles of Association, which determine among other things the role of Council, the composition of the Board of Trustees and the membership of the company.
6. That the membership of the company is a crucial issue to be addressed prior to incorporation, as members of the company have the final say on fundamental changes to the Memorandum and Articles of Association, and the right to call referenda.
7. That in order to register with the Charity Commission as an independent charity, OUSU must be a going concern and able to stand on its own two feet financially.
8. That OUSU has had recurring deficits for 8 of the last 10 financial years, of up to £65k.
9. That a funding model based on common room affiliation fees has left OUSU structurally under-funded and will not be able to sustain a student union that has a responsibility to deliver its services to all of its members.

#### **Council believes:**

1. That all students should be members of the new company, in line with the recommended advice of the National Union of Students and the Charity Commission.
2. That such a membership structure not only follows specialist advice but also conforms most closely to the 1994 Education Act and places control of fundamental changes to the structure of the charity in the hands of all students of the University.
3. That a funding model which is dependent on common room affiliation fees is incompatible with a universal membership structure and the requirement that OUSU be a going concern in order to achieve independent charitable status.
4. That the University should fund OUSU by means of a central block grant, so that OUSU is funded on the basis of its responsibilities to its members.
5. That Thomas Hull House is inaccessible to some students, comparatively expensive, and ill-suited to OUSU's activities, and that cheaper and more accessible premises would be preferable.

#### **Council resolves:**

1. To support the proposals and supporting reasoning in the Annexed Paper 'Urgent Challenges for OUSU and the University'.
2. To mandate the President to communicate Council's decision to officers and committees of the University.

**Proposed: Stefan Baskerville (University)**  
**Seconded: Eorann Lean (St. Hugh's)**

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Last council spoke to you at length, but not as long as some of you thought but will summarise this time. Can be found on the front of the pale blue booklet. I talked last time about the importance of having a properly funded student union and how this would help both the union and common rooms.

Three challenges facing us with incorporation, adopting mem and arts and registering with charity commission. 2<sup>nd</sup> is the funding crisis, and the fact that the way we are funded mismatches what we do. Not funded to support all students, but support all students.

3<sup>rd</sup> challenge relates to the lease on current premises very unlikely we will be able to get out of them really important that we keep it on the University agenda that they are aware it is not a good place for the SU to be housed, as it is inaccessible to disabled students.

3 solutions. All students' are members and that it accepts the implication of this for our funding model. Need to move towards funding on basis of all members and away from affiliation. Our obligations are to our members and yet we are not currently funded in a way we can meet this. Don't think we will be moving from current premises unlikely but should still be on the agenda.

Motion on 2<sup>nd</sup> paper of white booklet. Draws out key facts. Important beliefs and resolves. All students should be members, this follows advice and the 1994 Education act, and advises that affiliation is incompatible with this and states that the University should support us with block grants. It mandates me to fight for this with your backing.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):  
How many people did you consult with.

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):  
Have been in discussion with 6-8 Junior Common rooms. Meeting held which you intended. Emailed out for consultation.

Ben Britton (St Catherine's):  
Construction of this document did you consult in putting paper together?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ)  
I wrote it.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):  
Has the proposal changed at all as the result of consultation?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):  
No, nobody proposed any changes.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds):  
Regards to premises what developments?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):  
Initial discussion at committee and they said that unlikely at this time.

Jesse Harber (St Hilda's):  
What happens if we don't pass the proposals soon?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):  
If don't pass we go to JCCSM tomorrow and take budget that we have passed to them. Don't think they would be satisfied and would ask what we were intending to do about it.

Question:  
Will students still be represented through colleges?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

In a sense this won't change anything, there is no mem and arts, but are members by the 1994 Act. All students aside from those that have chosen to opt out are members currently. In a sense what proposing is status quo, not changing broad membership of OUSU. At OUSU council, common room reps will continue to constitute the main members with a vote. Just don't think there should be any financial deterrent from being a member.

Doesn't fundamentally change structure we have, but puts it into an incorporated form.

Ben Britton (St Catherine's):

In consideration for the amount you are proposing. Have you considered staff time and use of building.

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Have discussed with the University, will be a retrospective look. The matter has already been decided and we will make allocations at the end of the year.

The question is mute. Half the GM's salary and some of the accounts would still be accounted for by OSSL. No difference to bottom line

Dani Quinn (Merton):

If we go to JCCSM with a budget with a loss of £60,000 and you say they will look at the scale of OUSU, what would this actually mean.

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

It will be how much do students want their student union to do. We could literally stop spending apart from on salaries and rent and would still have 2/3rds of deficit left. We will need to employ less people to do less.

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Explain what our staff do, and how much they are paid?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Brief explanation of members of staff.

The GM was created after the abolishment of the VP Finance. Happened because we were electing annually a student to do financial planning which wasn't entirely working.

Student Advisor provides crucial advise to the SAS her work is invaluable.

Publications and Media Co-ordinator works on OxStu some of the week but also on whole range of publications we do.

Advertising Co-ordinator full time selling advertising opportunities.

Democratic Support Officer you see here every two weeks. Assisting Sabbatical officers to do their jobs

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

Does Education Act have this requirement for funding?

No. But states no student should be disadvantaged. All students need to be members, needs to be a going concern. Need to have a funding model which funds this effectively.

Ben Britton (St Catherine's):

Mentioned going concern. One of the provisions for the Charities Act is that you should have 6 months turnover in bank. How would you raise £200,000 before incorporating?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

My understanding is that a lot of charities don't have 6 months, but that this advises charities to build up to having this amount.

Joseph Cooke(Trinity)

Are there considerations that because the money won't be coming out of JCR and MCR budgets there budgets will be reduced?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Don't think common rooms should pay more and will make this very clear to the University.

Joseph Cooke (Trinity):

Would you faced with the choice, would you try and push it through?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Wouldn't want to force through think common room budgets are vital so not happy at all.

Nishma Doshi (Linacre):

Problem coming from MCR Common rooms disaffiliating would you be looking at doing more to ensure that they don't? And would funding allow OUSU to focus on the problems that MCR's have brought up?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Deficit would not be solved by other disaffiliated common rooms affiliating. It is indicative of the mismatch even if everyone affiliated would still have big funding problem.

What it would allow us to do would be focus on you guys, so much time has been spent on debating this could have got so much more done for students this is the last time we should look at this.

Tom Scott (New):

Last time came up bursars started to take money out of common room budgets.

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Think went wrong as tried to get too clever and worked out how it was to be funded. Should just go with a list of asks and say costs should not just be passed to common rooms. I give you a guarantee I will say this.

David Townsend (St Johns):

What savings could be made if this was approved? Would it fund shortfall, so removing incentive to save money?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Don't think would remove. If University agrees with substance. Should imagine would be conditions Talking today about cutting costs, with publications, using staff time. Build up expertise in office staff. If want more detail, then look into pale blue booklet explanation of OSSSL activities which reduce expenses.

2<sup>nd</sup> half cutting sabbatical staff costs, I can't do, this is your choice. We are conducting a review to ask for contributions about what OUSU should do. Should come up with a list of priorities. Might conclude sab team size right, or want more sabs, some people think less. A decision should be taken in an informed way after we know what people want. Trying to facilitate a process about what students want.

Jesse Harber (St Hilda's):

What in your accounting are the downsides? In this review of OUSU activities, how have you made the consultation?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Very few downsides. Downsides of alternatives are really the downsides. Most other unions funded by block grants. This is in the best interests of students.

Conducted an online survey, which got a 1000 responses. Have conducted several focus groups already one for MCR Presidents coming in next few weeks. This information will get drawn together. The best thing to do is report in first week Trinity term. Hoped would report in 5<sup>th</sup> week, but this is too soon as they would be rushed and incomplete. Need to ensure complete.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

When you add up all the assets and liabilities in addition for annual grant, what are you looking for to cover debt?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Net liabilities £35,000 have not looked for payment of debts, partly about how they want to play it.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

Disappointed not pursuing change of premises.

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

I am continuing this I really want to do this. Current premises are too expensive, the University is saying it is too expensive for us to do this. It depends on other questions. Need to try and resolve other questions. The process will have to be negotiated later down the line.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

How does it depend on funding model?

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

5,000 sq ft of space. Very clear that there is a lot of un-useable space.

Chair advises that he has received an amendment.

Amendment I

Council notes:

1. That OUSU, like other student unions in the UK, intends to register with the Charity Commission as a result of the changes made by the 2006 Charity Act.
2. That OUSU's planned date of registration is the 1<sup>st</sup> of August 2010.
4. That OUSU plans to incorporate prior to registration with the Commission, because of the protection from liability that a company affords to the trustees of the student union.

**Proposed: Rob Shearer (Linacre)**

**Seconded: Stefan Baskerville (University)**

Accepted as friendly by Stefan

Passes.

Point of order

Rob Shearer propose taking the motion in parts.

Speech in proposition

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

My concern is that it addresses three separate issues. Fact budget related seems the excuse to lump them together. Think shouldn't be voted on all at once.

Richard Knight (Lincoln)

Don't think we should waste more of Council's time.

Point of Clarification

Chair advises how it would go.

Notes 1-8, then 9, then believes 1&2 then resolves each alone.

If this motion passes debate whole motion, then at the end can pass each bit separately.

In favour of taking apart.

No one.

Procedural motion fails.

Speech in Opposition of motion.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

Eliminates accountability of CR's main way CR's can protest is to disaffiliate. This takes away this right. If this whole funding model passes won't we change constitution. Underlying problem is no management of the budget, this is just signing of a document which the President has written. This is not democratic. New funding model all oversight to the University. This sets up an adversarial relationship with the Uni. Going to be sent back as not enough consultations.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds):

Two quick points. Negotiating with University, we still do that present budget every year. Idea that bad financial management is poor thing to say about Deloitte's and the University.

Point of Information

Auditors just to review accounts.

Funding is a problem, if OUSU acted on its current model, then would have to drop standards.

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

This came out two weeks ago since then I have held an online survey and two consultations.

Dawn Hollis (Balliol)

Affiliation and disaffiliation wouldn't lose right, but would mean less reason to. When we brought this idea to GM it was almost unilaterally supported. This has been written by Stefan he has come up with a solution is there a more efficient way to do this, and isn't this what he is mandated to do?

Jesse Harber (St Hilda's)

Affiliation fees as way of getting OUSU to take your views into account? We have council, council is the foremost decision making body. If we said Stefan should sit in his office for a week he would have to. We have a perfect way to control OUSU and its activities could shut OUSU down tomorrow if we wanted.

Jack Matthews (St Peters):

Scrutiny, best way to scrutinise is to ask questions of the elected officers. Now in second year and no one has asked me a question. No one even asked me a question when I said I hadn't done a mandate, no one shouted at me at all. No one did anything.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

A council that holds people accountable.

Jonny Medland (The Queen's):

Reiterate points that have been made. Current model doesn't promote accountability. Lots of reps from disaffiliated common rooms but don't have any votes and opportunity to change what we do. If they disaffiliate sends a message but we can't listen to your voice because of the way council works. Should remove issue of finances by using this model. Current method structurally defunds the student union. Don't see alternatives. Went to University in 2007. Really a unique chance to change a union, which has two classes of members, and returning to Stefan's point from earlier. More important to solve these rather than discussing it again. We have more important things to talk about should get behind this motion and get the University to pay for it.

Sarah Hutchinson (St Cross):

Graduates. Think should support as in best interests of all students so we can focus on services and publicising the services we provide. I am at a disaffiliated college and will be going back to it. We tried to negotiate money

to affiliate, but they couldn't budge on this. The college then told the students that they couldn't come to OUSU, because of my experience could advise them that this would not true. It would be really useful if we could protect the services and could focus on the matters across about advise service, about the representation we do. So students could let us know would be much more effective.

I have had lots of personal meetings with MCR Presidents, and Stefan and Jonny have also met with them. Not that they have been cut out of the loop really hope they feel that they have been consulted.

Move to Vote.

Speech in proposition

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

It's really important it can't be stated enough how severe the next few years are going to be the current model doesn't give us the basis to do this.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

Truth is hasn't been solved is that solution the same but it keeps being turned down.

Speech in proposition of recorded vote.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

Would like everyone on record. The returning officer will read out everyone and it will be recorded.

In favour.

Fails no quarter majority.

Motion passes 47 for and none against. 4 abstentions.

---

### **3. Road Safety outside the King's Arms**

#### **Council notes:**

1. That the the junction outside the King's Arms pub is dangerous and leaves drivers, cyclists and pedestrians feeling unsafe
2. That an Oxford student was killed in an accident at the crossing in 2007, and a promised County Council review of the crossing has not yet taken place
3. That there are no provisions at the crossroads to assist people with disabilities meaning that it is inaccessible to many, forcing them to take wide detours.
4. To date 680 people have signed the online petition "Improve Road User Safety outside Kings Arms" petition <http://www.petitionspot.com/petitions/oxfordroaduser>

#### **Council believes:**

1. That an urgent review should be carried out into the safety of the crossing and appropriate measures, such as a pedestrian crossing should be installed as soon as possible
2. That the County Council should take the necessary measures, such as audible signs and a longer lighting sequence, to ensure that the crossing is accessible to people with disabilities
3. That measures should be taken to ensure that the many cyclists using the crossing each day can do so safely, for example with road markings for those wanting to turn right.

#### **Council resolves:**

1. To promote the "Improve Road User Safety outside Kings Arms" petition amongst its members
2. To mandate the Vice-President (Graduates) to promote the petition via local media
3. To mandate the Vice-President (Charities and Community) and the Vice-President (Welfare and Equal Opportunities) to write to the County Council and local County Councillors setting out the points in 'Council notes', asking for the measures set out in 'Council believes' to be implemented urgently and drawing attention to the support the petition has received.

**Proposed:** Alex Teytelboym (Wadham)  
**Seconded:** Sarah Hutchinson (St Cross)

Passed Nem Con

---

#### **4. Thirst Lodge's Lapdancing Licence**

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

1. Thirst Lodge has recently been granted a licence to become a sex encounter establishment (i.e., a lapdancing venue).
2. Wherever lapdance and strip clubs appear, women's quality of life deteriorates as a result, with increased reports of rape, harassment and fear of violence (Eden, 2003; Lilith Project, 2003) and increased fear of travelling. (TfL, 2004)
3. There are marked increases in violence, drunk and disorderly behaviour, and drug use, where clubs are granted lapdancing licences. (C.f. closing down of Senioritas/Isis in Birmingham, 2004)
4. Local residents are currently campaigning against the licence and have queried whether Thirst Lodge followed the correct procedure in applying for the licence, suggesting that they did not notify residents as stipulated by local council regulations.

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

1. OUSU stands against harmful or discriminatory behaviour towards women, local residents and students of Oxford.
2. Students have the power to change the behaviour of Thirst Lodge's management and encourage them to rethink their licence application.

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

1. To refrain from holding events at Thirst Lodge for the duration of the time they are registered as a sex encounter establishment.
2. To encourage students to refrain from going to Thirst Lodge for the duration of the time they are registered as a sex encounter establishment.
3. To mandate the OUSU President to send a letter to the management of Thirst Lodge informing them of OUSU's policy on this issue.
4. To support the Women's Campaign in raising awareness of this issue with those who it will affect, including residents of Oxford and members of Oxford Brookes.

**Proposed:** Yuan Yang (Balliol)  
**Seconded:** Elizabeth Bauer (Merton)

Chair uses standing order to move it up.

Yuan Yang (Balliol):

Take a collective breath in. We have discussed this over the last two weeks and it is highly considered. Background is that Thirst Lodge applied for this license. They said that they wouldn't and then they pushed it through before licensing laws changed.

Reason oppose many and varied. Welfare issues, looked at research and studies and case studies in Nottingham. Overall conclusion increase in violence and rape. Think similar things could happen here, which is why student union should campaign against it.

Many people in local community are against this so would be easy to raise this campaign.

David Townsend (St John's)  
Did they consult colleges?

Yuan Yang (Balliol):

No according to local people didn't. This issue hasn't been raised yet. After granted license local people found out and began to oppose it.

Question:

Is the license valid without consultation?

Yuan Yang (Balliol):

Yes because the council was not aware of this lack of consultation.

Lukas Wallrich (Merton)

Why not going to consult with council?

Yuan Yang (Balliol):

Lots of things planning to do, on of these is coordinate with other people who are against it before we take to council so we can do it in a unified way. Very important part of process.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

Provide references but have they been quoted?

Yuan Yang (Balliol):

1<sup>st</sup> one published periodically. Some are sociology reports. Some are from TFL.

Nishma Doshi (Linacre):

What are the council doing?

Yuan Yang (Balliol):

The council are holding a hearing, the people that granted the license weren't happy with it stated this to Oxford Mail.

Jesse Harber (St Hilda's)

This is the same Thirst Lodge which has already shown disregard to gender equality with having a mirror between the toilets which can be seen through.

Yuan Yang (Balliol):

Yes

David Townsend (St John's)

Can you provide us with the full references?

Yuan Yang (Balliol):

Yes of course definitely available if this is required.

Alice Heath (Univ)

Clarification on point 4.

Yuan Yang (Balliol):

Came up with more extensive list. First thing would be to do would be to liaise with other interested people. If we had different objections would still reject licence. Would ask OUSU to boycott Thirst Lodge and people to boycott people holding events there. Moving in from there would raise media interest if students involved, council would probably be even keener to act on this.

Rob Shearer (Linacre):

Every fact incorrect. They haven't applied for the license that suggested applied for incorrect. This information is from advocacy groups.

Point of Information  
TFL not an advocacy agency.

Can talk about statistical analysis. But is peer review analysis on this. Carolina didn't controlled experiment.

POI  
American culture significantly different.

Found that this is incorrect that lap dancing  
Reverse correlation doesn't really have much impact.

POI  
Do you oppose OUSU's position on this?

Only data point is that women are more concerned about their safety when travelling.

Chair advises on 5 min limit.

Reason I care about is the premise of the motion, is that this isn't modern feminism. Doesn't mean any less human. Sense of empowerment and flexibility mattered every one talked to is that society looks down on them. See Oxford students looking down on and feel right to judge.

Alice Heath (Univ):  
Motion not commenting on people inside club, speaking for people outside club. Don't want to go near Thirst Lodge if this is the case, quite a lot of women might agree.

Sarah Hutchinson (St Cross):  
Felt uncomfortable since people can look at me when I am unaware. Think important that people are aware so that all people feel comfortable going to clubs advertised to our societies.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds):  
Feel Rob made good points, so WomCam hopefully have good information. Grounds to strike 2 and 3.  
Council notes 4 is very important. Community around Thirst Lodge don't want it, withdrew and then sneaked through. Furthermore license could be illegal if got on dodgy ground. All dancing may therefore be illegal.

Move to Vote.  
Jonny Medland (The Queen's):  
Feel points have been made.

Lukas Wallrich (Merton)  
Would like to hear response to the criticism of your sources. Would like these to be taken out by amendment.

Vote  
24 to 10 so 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority.

Point of Order  
Need someone to take up opposition.

Speech in proposition  
Yuan Yang (Balliol):  
There are lots of objections to this not only these studies but University studies have been done on these. Can just confirm that these are studies that have been published in well respected institutions. Even if don't like statistical evidence. Study have been done in Nottingham.

Many of us wouldn't feel comfortable, so we should directly oppose it. The effects on passers by. Lastly would like to state that there is no condemnation on people that work in these areas. What we think of empowerment is creating situations where people feel safe to walk and we know modern concepts on women's feminism is complex.

Speech in opposition.

Mae Penner (Magdalen):

Think WomCam wants to propose it, and then it is up to us. Women should be allowed to separate. If not illegal then shouldn't support

Votes in favour of motion

Motion passes.

Chair: We will now be hearing Motion 2 please stay if you can.

Speech in proposition.

Call for quorum in council

Joe advises why the Thirst Lodge Motion was moved ahead of this.

Quorum counted and reached.

---

## **2. Equal Access for Asylum Seekers**

### **Council notes:**

1. Article 26 of the UDHR which states "Everyone has the right to education... and higher education shall be equally accessible to all..."
2. That at Oxford University, asylum seekers are classed as international students and for a typical undergraduate degree at Oxford have to pay £14,000 pounds per annum fees instead of the "home fee" rate of £3,290.
3. That asylum seekers cannot afford these fees (or living costs) because they are neither allowed to apply for student loans nor work in the UK and that asylum seekers are unable to apply for a bursary from Oxford University
4. That it may take months or even years for an asylum application to be processed.
5. Oxford Student Action for Refugee's campaign for equal access to university for asylum seekers.
6. NUS policy in support of STAR's campaign to guarantee equal access for asylum seekers in UK Higher Education (2008)
7. The success of STAR's campaign in Manchester, London Met, Liverpool, Manchester Met, Middlesex and Edgehill universities, which now offer home-rate tuition fees to asylum seekers.

### **Council believes:**

1. That everyone ought to have an equal opportunity to education.
2. That no-one should have to put their entire life on hold for years unable to get an education.
3. That the current funding system, both nationally and within Oxford University, is unfairly punitive towards asylum seekers.
4. That Oxford University should take a leading role in this national campaign

### **Council resolves:**

1. To pledge support to STAR's campaign
2. To mandate OUSU President and Vice President Access & Academic Affairs to lobby the Vice Chancellor to:
3. Offer degrees at 'home rate' prices to Asylum Seekers.(this would essentially require the university to subsidise degrees for Asylum Seekers, to make up for the gap in government funding.)
4. To make the Oxford Bursary available to Asylum Seekers.

5. To pledge Oxford University's support and campaign for a change in government policy that will give Asylum Seekers equal rights to government funding.

**Proposed: Michael Walker (Wadham)**

**Seconded: Rebecca Hay (Wadham)**

Speech in proposition

Michael Walker (Wadham):

Part of a national campaign. Currently people waiting for their status are classified as asylum seekers so are charged at International student rates.

Alice Heath (Univ):

Yes has been won at several University.

David Townsend (St John's)

If are finally deported then will the University claim back the funding gap? Will they have debt to the University, will the University be angry.

Michael Walker (Wadham):

This would be a friendly act of the Uni. Could take the position that they are not liable if they are deported.

Lukas Wallrich (Merton):

For my understanding is that Asylum seekers can be charged at home fee. How could they afford to study at all?

Michael Walker (Wadham):

Some charities support them.

Jesse Harber (St Hilda's):

How many people will this benefit?

Not sure how this would sway people, think important as a principle.

Jack Matthews (St Peter's):

Do you know percentage of asylum seekers deported and how long in country before deported?

Michael Walker (Wadham):

No don't know figures, but know a lot in limbo for a long time.

Jack Matthews (St Peter's):

Do you think would be a problem that a large number of people would be taking up, could be halfway through a rewarding education.

Another campaign for us to take on.

No speech in opposition

Tom Coledge-Davies (Merton):

I have certain views were I might agree with it, but think resulting effect going to be negligible. Legal status is waiting to be granted status. Financial status going to be less than International students. Some may not have a legitimate reason.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds):

Mandate from college. St Edmunds student feel unfair that home student will have to support this when their taxes would be raised this.

Lukas Wallrich

Do we give them the benefit of the doubt that they may be given residence.

Michael Walker (Wadham):

First point taxes, but university paying difference, so can't see this.

Oxford is a meritocracy, so shouldn't be denied just because asylum seekers.

Stefan Baskerville (Univ):

Speak in favour think massive waste of human potential when people are growing up in London, children of people who are waiting for asylum have grown up with British education system and this a barrier to their continuing development. Think we should remove this barrier,

Mae Penner (Magdalen):

Major issue is the process of seeking for applying is so prolonged. Think that is the major issue, won't resolve as won't be able to afford home fees. Positive contribution small. This won't help much.

Council resolves 4 seems to address this.

Move to Vote

Speech in opposition

Vote in favour of move to vote

2/3rds majority.

Speech in proposition

Just seems an important thing to support.

Process think unsatisfactory, effect minimal can cause huge disruption. Noble aspect is just plugging a hole.

Vote

In favour 26

Against 4

Abstention 2

Motion passes