

Apologies: Rachel Logan, Marc Stoneham, Mel Marshall

Meeting of OSSL. Elected as trustees.

Minutes of previous Council: Andrew Thomas, St Annes: Please can you not put abbreviations of names.  
Julia Buckley, Chch: Only put abbreviations where obvious. Waste of paper.

Vote - AT loses. Minutes passed.

C: Ratifications in Council:

Elections Committee: Will Straw, Sean Sullivan, Andy Garlick, Sonia Sodha, Katherine Wheatley ratified.

Divisional Board Rep, Maths and Physical sciences: Adam Booth ratified.

D: Elections in Council:

ICT: Jakob Macke (Somerville). Husted by Luke Haywood, Somerville

Andrew Thomas: Can you say something about him

LH: 2nd yr maths, somerville IT rep.

Jane McTaggart, HMC: What are political affiliations:

LH: don't know

Edd Southerden, Somerville: Were you a wicked IT rep:

LH: Yes

Complaints Board: Richard Foster (Balliol), Daniel Harkin (SEH), Ali Richardson (SEH), Josh Kern (Pembroke),  
Conor O'Neill (Wadham)

Andrew Copson for Richard Foster: Wants to be involved - 1st year. No political affiliations.

DH: 2nd yr english student. Ill today. Will be unbiased.

AR: JCR president, not OUSU insider. Will be fair.

CN: Chair of Council, was on Wadham SU Complaints panel.

Ryan McGhee for JK: Was president. Would do a good job.

Nick Anstead, Mansfield: Do you have any links with the papers?

DH: Features ed for OXstu, but don't know what's going on.

AR: No

CN: No

JK: No

RF: No, only a first year.

Edd Southerden: Political affiliations?

AR: none

CN: none

JK: none

RF: none

DH: been to OULC meetings, lapsed membership.

Results to be announced Monday.

Phil Thompson, SJC: Why is the RO not doing the RO's job?

Will Straw, New: He has a job. I am DRO till more appointed on monday.

---

Reports from sabbaticals

Will Straw: Have been touched by support on stance for international issues. Won't take part in debate, and won't comment, but will stay in room. Will carry out mandate in the manner an OUSU president should.

NUS Regional conference: Went there. Doing good stuff. Edd is doing a review of OUSU/NUS relations, and wants feedback please.

Edd Southerden: Do I mind seeing NUS reps to talk to them?

WS: No you love it.

Ros Dampier, St Hildas: Re: the support you say you have received from sabs - is it emotional support or do the sabs agree with your stance?

WS: Sabs agreed with me. Exec had concern over the mandate issue.

Laura Santana, St Hildas: Did you say in your manifesto that Council was an inappropriate place for international issues?

WS: yes

Andrew Thomas: What is the purpose of the NUS review?

WS: At the moment NUS is not value for money. St. Hugh's and Keble have disaffiliated. Means something is wrong. Need lower rates and better services.

Oscar Van Nooijen, Queens: Thanks for clearing up your position. But it didn't say you didn't want to discuss international issues in your manifesto. It said you wanted to stop time wasting and Mickey Mouse motions, and make Council more efficient. Now it looks less efficient. I would not have been an activist for you if you had made that clear.

WS: Sorry you didn't understand. I said in hustings that my position was always clear. The Iraq motion is a Mickey Mouse motion.

Matt Sellwood, New: Can you comment on the fact that the university has switched to green?

WS: Yes, it shows what student action can achieve.

Catherine Wallis, Keble: Can Edd please talk to OUSU reps too?

WS: Yes

Ryan Mcghee, Pembroke: Do you know your statement on international issues went down very well?

WS: Yes. It is possible there will be a reaffiliation motion at Oriel because of my stance – they certainly support my position.

Daniel Harkin, SEH: Can you explain what form the NUS review will take? Is it the same process of the review of VP Women?

WS: No, more informal, but want to consult widely.

Laura Santana: Have you actually made any investigation into the sentiment of students in Oxford about international issues?

WS: There has been no survey, but I have spoke to JCRs and got lots of support.

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hildas: When do F&F petitions have to be returned?

WS: Deadline pushed back from Nov to Jan. Need to carry on getting signatures.

Ali Richardson, SEH: Do you think the majority of presidents have been supportive of your stance on international issues?

WS: yes

Matt Sellwood: Your manifesto said you wanted to make Council more welcoming. Don't you think your quotes in Cherwell made it more intimidating?

WS: I have the right to oppose anything. International issues are inappropriate.

Peter Morton, Somerville: Is the support of office holders you talk about in a personal or proper capacity?

WS: For Exec and sabs yes.

Point of information: Laura Santana: That isn't true.

WS: I have expressed my stance in sab meetings, exec meetings and prescom and have not been opposed. Don't shake your head at me.

LS: I can shake my head if I want to.

Edd Southerden: Do you plan to judge motions on their individual merits or apply a blanket ban?

WS: Latter. Council is an inappropriate forum for international issues.

P Duncan Weldon, Somerville: Does the case of Richard Low reaffirm the need to discuss international issues?

WS: No. We support him as an Oxford student.

Rodrigo Davies, Wadham: Is the official support for you minuted?

WS: Exec minutes are on website. Prescom is in camera. There are no minutes of sab meetings.

Rosie Buckland, St Hildas: Can you confirm if there was a vote in exec?

WS: No there wasn't.

Nicky Ellis, Queens: Was the exec support for your procedure or for your statement you are making?

WS: former.

Andrew Copson, Balliol: point of order - ask exec in questions.

---

Sean Sullivan:

Ali Richardson: What is your opinion on whether the Iraq motion is Ultra Vires?

SS: Exec has mandated me to get legal advice, but have not made a definite ruling. My personal belief is that it is.

Penny Berrill, St Hildas: When does the disabilities guide come out? It was shelved last year.

SS: Hope 6th week.

Laura Santana: Do you support Will in your official capacity?

SS: Completely.

Ali Richardson: What is your opinion on paid sabs taking time to discuss international issues and seek opinion?

SS: Debating issues is not UV.

Ros Dampier: UV is about no expenditure. Exec are not paid. How is this UV?

SS: Would take too much time to explain here. Has been discussed in exec.

Helena Puig Larrauri: Will you have the rulings by next Council?

SS: Not sure - emailed on Tuesday but no reply.

Jane McTaggart: Can we have copies of the ruling?

SS: Yes

Oscar Van Nooijen: What's happening with the shop?

SS: Emergency meeting today. Two staff have left. Takings down. Priority is to keep the service going.

Katherine Radice, Magdalen: How is the Iraq motion UV? I want to tell my JCR.

SS: Not sure if it would be helpful. Grey area - some believe it is UV, some don't. Tell JCRs that OUSU can pass it whatever.

Nick Anstead: Was it discussed in Exec?

SS: Yes

Will Straw: The ruling is not back yet.

Ali Richardson: Can Sean summarise for the presidents?

Edd Southerden: Can you reiterate OUSU policy on UV and debates?

SS: OUSU policy is to oppose UV. I have to make sure we don't infringe the UV laws. Will send prelist guidelines we use.

Chris Sullivan, St. Anne's: Why is the shop shutting early?

Sean Sullivan: Two staff have left

Matt Sellwood, New: Wasn't the World Trade Centre motion last year UV but no-one ever noticed?

SS: I raised it then. We sent a letter, but we have to keep within the law. OUSU is a very prominent student union, good target.

Ros Dampier, St Hildas: If you have a conflict of interest between personal beliefs and OUSU policy, what are you doing to uphold policy?

SS: I am sticking to policy when asked.

Katherine Radice, Magdalen: In what way are the Iraq resolves UV?

SS: It involves spending SU money - not students as students.

Nicky Ellis, Queens: Can you explain how UV law works - relates to action not discussion.

SS: Have done to Matt and prelist. UV will only become an issue when motion passed.

---

VP Welfare

Andrew Copson, Balliol: 1: The African SU tour is not coming - no-one knows why. 16 people and only one got visa. Very frustrating.

2: nominations open for elections - remind everyone there are regs governing elections over harassment and defamation. Hope no-one will be naughty enough to do anything which would bring them before the proctors / Uni harassment advisor.

Conor O'Neill, Wadham: Everyone must behave here too

AC on behalf of VP Women: sorry there was no Nightbus last night - the driver never turned up.

Questions: Laura Santana, St Hilda's: Do you support Will's stance?

AC: Yes in a professional capacity for his personal reasons, but don't agree that issues shouldn't arise.

Ryan McGhee, Pembroke: Did you check the background of the delegations?

AC: People and Planet looked into it - they are student activists but nothing serious.

Peter Morton, Somerville: What are Nightbus hours?

AC: Thurs-sat 11pm-2am. £1 anywhere inside the ringroad.

Helen McCabe, St. Hilda's: Worried about BNP in Oxford - what is happening with Anti Racism?

AC: Anti-Racism co chairs not here. But will be campaigning.

Nicky Ellis: is chasing co-chair. No entz or talks planned, just campaigning.

Penelope Berrill, Hildas: review of property - will it decrease the standard of welfare service?

AC: all changes to University Council next MT.

Edd Southerden, Somerville: is One World students as students?

Nicky: Can't answer.

---

VP Ac Aff

Sonia Sodha, St Hildas. Nothing to add.

Questions: Ali Richardson, SEH: Are you aware of any basis for the tute in peril campaign?

SS: no - not abandoning tutes. I have been reassured. Must monitor what is going on. Some faculties are changing way of teaching, but have been assured Tute will stay as centre point.

Laura Santana: Do you agree with Will that debates on international issues are a waste of time?

SS: No, but it is the right of the individual to abstain.

Georgia Toynbee, Balliol: Can you publicise JCC on website?

SS: Yes - when I have got names. Takes time to ring around getting details - have persuaded university to do it for us. I need to know what's going on.

Rodrigo Davies, Wadham: Are you aware that Senior Tutor Committee advised that 8 tutes be cut to 4 and 4 classes?

SS: Yes because saw the OxStu. Senior Tutors committee is the only one I don't sit on, but have seen the document - will talk more about it in the motion.

James Lazou, Wadham: do you think that gowns are an access issue?

SS: Yes - maintains a certain image of Oxford.

Helena Puig Larrauri, Hildas: How can OUSU help students get access to JCCs?

SS: planning a forum for JCC reps but need names.

Ryan McGhee: Are you aware colleges will vote against these proposals? Worcester, Pembroke already decided - unlikely it will come to anything.

SS: No

Hinesh Rajani, Merton: Are there any advantages in classes?

SS: will wait for students' views. Need to support JCCs. JCCs must consult students and decide.

Ali Richardson: possibility of oxford breaking away - will it be negative to applications:

SS: don't think it will. but is concerning that the national media is saying it.

Ed Watkins, Keble: if your library has not got the books you need and it is a weekend, what can OUSU do?

SS: Had manifesto pledge for longer opening hours - want to seek sponsorship but had no time to do it yet.  
Contact me or ac aff rep.

Andrew Thomas, St Annes: when will you start?

SS: sorry not to have done it before - had no time yet.

---

VP Grads

Andy Garlick, Chch: Mature students committee - liaising with jcr/mcr ousu reps, please tell your Common Rooms about it.

Catherine Wallis, Keble: what is the proportion of mature students?

AG: they don't apply through the UCAS system - more out of Harris Manchester than in.

Laura Santana: Is debating international issues a waste of time?

AG: I support Will's decision. International issues are not relevant.

Ros Dampier: In light of the VP Women consultation, are you worried about your own position?

AG: Graduate students have different needs from others.

---

Reports from Exec

Julia Buckley, Chch: Need new OUSU reps co-chair - contact me, Will or Josh Goodman.

Catherine Wallis: What college is Josh?

JB: Balliol

Laura Santana: Is debating international issues a waste of time?

JB: No

No other exec reports.

Questions to exec

P Duncan Weldon/ Laura Santana: Is debating international issues a waste of time?

Rosie Buckland, St Hildas: Not a waste of time - all relevant

Phil Thompson, SJC: No

Liz Chare, Linacre: no. They are relevant but in the past motions have wasted time.

Chris Hanretty, St Annes: Support Will, but anyone should be able to bring a motion.

Sean Sullivan: We should be concerned with students as students. International motions are a waste of time and we should vote not to put them.

Edd Southerden, Somerville: No. We should listen to them, if we don't it would be rude and undemocratic.

Andrew Thomas, St Anne's: Anything should be relevant to bring to council, and Will should fulfill his mandate.

What would happen if his Dad was made Education Secretary - would he not speak on education issues?

Nicky Ellis, Queens: support Will's decision but he should have anticipated it. But anyone should be allowed to bring any motion, and we should all support that process and stop timewasting. Motions should be discussed,

but are not a waste of time.

Damian Jenkins, St Hughs: Have you supported Will's personal choice?

Rosie Buckland: I respect his honesty but no. Am OK with new decision.

Phil Thompson: Now, yes, but made the wrong first choice.

Chris Hanretty: Yes

Liz Chare: Yes

Andy Garlick: Yes

Will Straw: Yes

Andrew Copson: Yes

Sean Sullivan: Yes

Edd Southerden: He should fulfill his mandate. I support his not speaking but he must do his mandate.

Nicky Ellis: he must be aware he looks like he is not putting people's views across.

Julia Buckley: not before but am ok with new decision

Sonia Sodha: Yes

C: Ratifications in Council: AR campaign - no opposition.

G: Emergency motions

I: All African Student Union prop Andrew Copson

Andrew Copson: We spent lots of time organising it and all work wasted. Secretary General got visa but no-one else. I want to find out why, they are not terrorists or asylum seekers.

Ryan McGhee: Would OUSU want to oppose immigration control?

Conor O'Neill: Look it up

Tom Hart, Univ: If they were turned down for a legitimate reason we can't support them.

Hinesh Rajani: Any reason to think that they're not terrorists?

AC: they are leaders of student unions - very few reasons to want to live here - have never blown anything up.

Rodrigo Davies: Is the high commission infallible?

AC: no evidence to support that. Just have restrictions on some countries.

Josh Goodman, Balliol: do we have evidence that they're not terrorists? What reason do we have to condemn the suspicion?

AC: If we find they are terrorists, we won't write to the high commission

Katy Higgins, SJC: Is it true that they were coming to give talks and then just go home?

AC: yes

Nick Anstead, Mansfield: is the key word in the motion "investigate"?

AC: yes

mtv – **Motion passes**

---

2: Top up fees prop Will Straw

Will Straw: Scary stuff at the moment. Top up fees to be announced in Jan. F&F v busy, Sir Colin Lucas (chair

of russell group & Vice-Chancellor of Oxford) is fudging.  
Lots of info in motion.

Edd Southerden: does OUSU have policy in favour of non violent direct action?  
Conor O'Neill: Look it up yourself

Oscar Van Nooijen, Queen's: Can you meet him?  
WS: He refuses to give a statement, except for what's written in notes 4.vii.

James Lazou: Any idea what decision will be from your private conversations?  
WS: Can't say.

Helena Puig Larrauri: Is the point of this motion to make him play his hand?  
WS: Yes - top up fees could be catastrophic.

Joseph McAuley, Chch: Are you aware that Lucas was quoted as being in favour of top up fees yesterday?  
WS: He hasn't been explicit. He has called it an "option". OUSU believes in another solution.

MTV – **Motion passes.**

---

H: Motions nem con

**1 - freshers fair prop eleanor thompson**

**3 - common room meetings**

**5 - oxfordshire play association**

**7 - college contribution scheme**

Procedural motion: that motion 9 (Iraq) not be put.

Ali Richardson, SEH: this is a waste of time. There are more important motions and this is definitely UV. We should stop OUSU's reputation as an irrelevant talking shop. Would make a mockery of the student union. OUSU is just a bloody good service provider.

Andrew Copson - yes it's true that we provide lots of services, but we are also a student union. We are more effective as a larger voice. It doesn't matter if it's UV - we are stating this is what we believe, and are prevented by saying it by a law we don't like. Any member of OUSU could and should then write saying my SU believes this.

Vote: fails: 29 for, 42 against, 2 abstentions.

---

J: motions to amend constitution

1. Oxford Directory - first reading.

Sean Sullivan: directory provides a good service - details of clubs and societies. Not doing its job very well - goes out of date in one term - losing £2,251. It is not good enough. Loses us money - fragile budget. Want details instead to go onto the brilliant website. Would save £2000 loss, which could be used for better purposes. Mandate me to improve the website if you want.

Catherine Wallis: Are all oxford registered societies going to be on website? Will there be content control?  
SS: makes clear on website that it's not OUSU - disclaimer. It is a service we provide.

Georgia Toynbee: would the situation be the same with the handbook and Life?

SS: Life is not a University society.

Hinesh Rajani: Most societies have a herald account, so doesn't go out of date.

SS: a lot do but a lot don't.

Joseph McAuley: What are the OUSU hits?

WS: 83,000 so far, 1,500 a week.

Peter Orlov, New: How many hits are from OUSU offices?

SS: only about 10 every day.

Alex Denner, New: could you print anything for non-computer people?

SS: University has a better list.

Andy Garlick: will it be an advantage for foreign students?

SS: yes - loads more availability.

MT debate. **Motion passes.**

---

M: 2: Consultation on female representation in OUSU prop Will Straw.

Procedural motion - that voting on amendment be recorded vote.

Ros Dampier: we have a right to know how people are voting with no JCR mandates.

Procedural motion passed.

Proposal of main motion. Will Straw: Jane Blumer (OUSU, VP Women, 2000-01) in her final report advised that VP Women be abolished. Has been lots of whispering since. Need full review. We need a wider scheme for female representation and must consider all options. The motion has been written by the sabs. It affects the structures of the student union, will affect all members, not just women. Should consult women most, but everyone deserves to be consulted.

Penelope Berrill, St Hildas: Exec minutes on the web of 2nd week quote Andrew Copson "Can we not sell it as a review of the sab structures". Is this right?

WS: No, he didn't say that.

Ros Dampier: The quote is on the website in Exec minutes from 2nd week.

Andrew Copson: I did not say that.

Helen McCabe: What is the m/f proportion of the university?

Catherin Wallis: 43% women JCR members, 33% MCR, 20% SCR.

Paul Afshar, SJC: will the final reports be bound by OUSU policy?

WS: yes

Penny Berrill: surely it's an anomaly that if the post is elected just by women it's not just women who are consulted?

WS: no, it affects all students, and is important all should be consulted.

Laura West, St Catz: How have the chairs been appointed?

WS: sabs have lots of time. Sonia and Andy are detached enough.

Georgia Toynbee: the title of the motion is female representation, so why are you talking about structures?  
Ruled not a short factual question.

Oscar Van Nooijen, Queens: if passed will men take part in Council?

WS: it would be unconstitutional not to, so yes.

Edd Southerden, Somerville: was Sonia appointed because she is a woman.

WS: yes

Ros Dampier: Was Andy appointed because he is a man?

WS: Yes. but he is fully capable of doing it too.

Ros Dampier: can you clarify the exec minutes that the review should be about female representation in OUSU?

WS: yes.

Rodrigo Davies: what do you mean by affecting everyone - how different is it from the elections?

WS: restructuring affects all sabs, and all should be consulted.

Friendly amendment prop Andrew Copson: to add to 3) all former sabbaticals of OUSU who can be contacted.

**Friendly amendment to main amendment: to add to 3) all previous female sabs.**

Discussion on amendment prop Ros Dampier:

Ros Dampier: amendment looks longer than it is. It is just basically replacing every person with female people. Notes 2 - "desire for consultation" is not accurate, and quite contentious and should not be there. Agenda of meetings to be set by the chairs - preemptory.

Issue of female representation in OUSU - so it concerns women. VP Women is the only guaranteed female sab position and student advice service person. We should respect women's views in OUSU and make the consultation female only.

Andrew Copson: It affects the structure of the student union, so all should be consulted.

Eleanor Thompson, Wadham: The title is female representation in OUSU

AC: maybe we should rename it "consultation of structures of female representation in OUSU."

Ros Dampier: Where is the question set in the motion?

AC: Resolves 1.

Andrew Copson: the motion is about the whole structure of representation. Not just women affected when VP Women created.

Another friendly amendment to amendment prop Laura West: **Add Council resolves 3 (x) That all female OUSU Council Delegates should be consulted.**

Georgia Toynbee: if you are talking about female representation you must consult women. First you talk to them then you can talk to the other OUSU members, but no need for it now.

Catherine Wallis: it is an outrage that the male majority will decide the issue of female representation. Cat Fletcher from NUS supports Women's Campaign vote. NUS Women's campaign will support us. Quote from

OUSU policy p33 Women from 5th week mt99: "resolves to support the role of women's officer in college. To oppose any move to replace the role of the Women's Officer with that of Equal Opportunities or Women's Welfare." This applies to OUSU Structure too.

Nick Anstead: If it is only females to vote, does this mean you get extra votes for female JCR presidents?  
Ros Dampier: no, we have taken that bit out.

Andy Garlick: I am a man. The consultation on female representation in the university needs an emphasis on women, but does affect the SU as a whole. Needs some male discussion at some stage. Chairs are there to listen collate and report. Why shouldn't I be involved in the consultation because I am a man? 2 sabs have been chosen because it's a big job.

Point of information - ros dampier: that's why we're recommending 2 chairs.

Andy Garlick: my maleness doesn't affect ability to present a fair case. Graduates are a minority and can give valuable input.

Jane McTaggart, HMC: it is clear Andrew and Will don't understand the difference between women's representation and restructuring. We need it to be discussed by women because it is about our representation.

Sean Sullivan: consultation to be voted on in council - all to be voted on. How can men vote on the motion if they have not been consulted? It is not true they must consult women only. It would be absurd if it was revealed we need a change and male sabs don't have a say. It will be more detrimental if not a full discussion.

MTV 45-30-2: fails.

Lesley Ann Perry, SJC: this is about guaranteed female representation, if the position is elected by women, it should be discussed by women.

Sonia Sodha: A recorded vote is v. important, and it will be v. clear who said what in consultation - all women can go to Women's Campaign. Council will vote in the end - if council believes women's ideas should be prominent, they can take note. It is inappropriate to bring men in just at council. The chairs will only collate info - the agenda is set by the motion. It should be as fair as possible - we need to know what the different stakeholders think - it is up to us to disregard what men say if that's what we want.

Rodrigo Davies: I am a man. It is not an issue of structure but of female representation. Women are the only stakeholders as regards female representation.

James Lazou: what's wrong with the VP Women?

Conor O'Neill: irrelevant question. Read last council's minutes.

Georgia Toynbee: appreciate Andy's comments about the Chairship - sure he would be impartial - but women should be consulted re female representation then review structure. Only 27 women in Council and 50 men - this would be taking their voice away. If it is really about representation, then it should be women only. As regards men voting in Council - the initial consultation will be thorough - men can base their vote on the consultation. We want a consultation in the right forum, which is women only.

Damian Jenkins: I sit on lots of things. Am very concerned. It is rude to keep me out. If you want to spend more money, a financial change affects everyone in OUSU. I have a mandate from my college on this.

MTV Chris Sullivan St Annes: This amendment is offensive to men. I want to leave.

Ros Dampier: There's lots more to say, it is a very important issue.

35-32-5 fails.

Eleanor Thompson, Wadham: When I vote in Council, I will want a clear view of women's opinion as they are the only people qualified to decide. Everyone will be able to discuss it in Council.

Andrew Thomas: Plea to men - please abstain on this vote

Ros Dampier: That is admirable but won't work

Ryan McGhee: Men must use their voice. It is 2002 and you must trust men - it is disgusting that you are not. There are no positions for men or ethnic minorities.

Liz Chare, Linacre: If it is about female representation, it is a question for women. Afterwards we can involve the men.

MTV Ali Richardson: We've heard it all

Ros Dampier: You haven't heard it all

49-30-1 fails

Rebecca Wilkinson, SEH: Ryan has made a good point - why shouldn't we consult men? An access officer is not necessarily from an access background. Men can make valid points, don't know why we are distrusting them.

Georgia Toynbee: point of information - this is not about distrust of men

Laura West, St Catz: This is a consultation process, we do not need to consult men. Of course we respect some men but it is not appropriate to consult them now.

Oscar Van Nooijen: It would be meaningless to consult men. If all men wanted a VP women and no women did, because men outnumber women we'd have one still.

Ros Dampier: This is a misinterpretation of the amendment. It is not offensive to men, but it is an issue of female representation. Women are underrepresented in Council, among JCR presidents and at an MCR level. This is why we should consult only women, because OUSU has a majority of men.

Catherine Wallis: It is not an issue of trusting men. It is an issue of autonomy in the women's liberation campaign. We need to campaign for what this means - women's campaign is closed to men, so this should be too.

Andrew Copson: We will have a clear view of women's views in our report. See resolves 1.1 "investigate and assess the efficiency of the current structures of female representation" OUSU policy is to delegate power to underrepresented groups. This is purely about structure.

Sean Sullivan: Worried the motion is being misrepresented. This is a consultation about female representation tied up in the structures of OUSU - the two are entwined. Women will be consulted alone and with others.

MTV passes.

Ros Dampier: this is a motion about female representation. Tying it up with structure is confusing the issue. If it is purely about structure, then we should be reviewing the position of all sabs. This motion will stifle women's voice.

Will Straw: This is about structures - anything else muddles the issue.

**Recorded vote on amendment: passes 50-32-2**

Will Straw -point of order - We withdraw the motion.

Sonia Sodha: There is an issue of who chairs the review - have concerns about my work portfolio suffering. Want to bring another motion regarding who should chair the review.

Ros Dampier takes the motion. Jane McTaggart seconds it.

MTV on main motion: Ali Richardson: We have changed the fundamentals of it now, but let's get on with it.

Will Straw: there is concern over the chairmanship of it. Women's campaign should now work with Sonia.

Please withdraw the motion or vote against it.

MTV fails

Friendly amendment prop Ros Dampier sec Georgia Toynbee: **Replace Council resolves 2 with "For the Executive to appoint 2 female members of OUSU as co-chairs of the consultation exercise."**

Ros Dampier: It is time for consultation now.

Damian Jenkins: point of order - want procedural motion to postpone this to ask JCRs for views.

Ros Dampier: We have agreed on female representation. There has been a long debate, let's vote on it now.

Procedural motion fails.

Andrew Copson: Oppose the motion - need to comment on structures. You don't know how the VP women and VP welfare interact. Need to rephrase the motion and change the consultation.

MTV

Ros Dampier: It's clear this is not what people want. Let's start the process and vote on it.

Sean Sullivan: Georgia and Ros weren't happy with the consultation. Bring it back to clarify what the consultation is about. Exec won't find two people to do it.

**Motion Passes 39-31-10**

---

Nick Bennett: Can all Presidents please get back to me about CROs.

---

Motion 3 - Common Room Meetings prop Alex Denner, New

Alex Denner, New: We need clear mandates on how to vote.

MTV – **Motion passes**

---

Motion 4: Gowns in exams Prop James Lazou, Wadham

Conor O'Neill: There is actually OUSU policy on gowns in exams.

James Lazou, Wadham: This got passed through Wadham. It is an access issue - gowns are uncomfortable.

People are admitted on their academic merits, gowns should not stop them achieving what they're capable of.

Ali Richardson: Can you remove your gown in an exam?

James Lazou: Yes

AR: Ah.

Laura Santana: Is there any part in the university prospectus where applicants will see gowns?

JL: We were told about them on open days.

Nick Anstead: Is it true that stories in the press often have pictures of gowns?

JL: Yes - reinforces a traditional view of Oxford.

Hinesh Rajani, Merton: Wouldn't people apply anyway?

JL: The access scheme works, but sub fusc is not representative of people from poorer backgrounds. They don't perceive Oxford as being right for them.

Sonia Sodha: Is it true that if you don't wear sub fusc to your exams you get chucked out?

JL: yes, or fined.

Debate: Sonia Sodha: It's difficult convincing people from non traditional backgrounds to apply to Oxford. It won't get in the press if we abolish sub fusc but it can help change people's perceptions and is a small change for us to make. Unless someone has a good reason for sub fusc why not vote with the motion?

Hinesh Rajani: point of information: Are we just talking about sub fusc in exams?

JL: Yes

Nick Anstead: Sub fusc is only 150 years old. The move is important to be meritocratic. In line with work on Target schools, top up fees etc. Sub fusc stands in the way of our ultimate goal. I know from open days that lots of people applied to Cambridge because they were scared of sub fusc.

MTV passes 49-22-1

James Lazou: This is a very serious access issue. People not applying cannot vote, so vote for the nation.

Hinesh Rajani: Anecdotal evidence about lack of applications. It is not an access issue. Some people do GCSEs in uniform, this is no different. We shouldn't have decided with so little debate.

**Passes 36 for, 32 against, 5 abstentions**

---

Motion 6: Undergraduate teaching prop Sonia Sodha

Sonia Sodha: This is an important issue. Tutorial reform reduces teaching time for academics, not just reducing tutes. 1998 North report - average number should be 1 tute plus classes and seminars per week. Conducted pilot review already, should be more class teaching in some papers. Best place to oppose this is undergraduate JCCs. Mandate about move to class based teaching. Want to encourage JCCs to work with faculties. Need to lobby to get a university wide system.

Louise McMullen, Wadham: Are any changes resource linked?

SS: Yes. We should use it as an opportunity to improve undergraduate teaching.

Edd Southerden: Are JCCs good enough to cope with it?

SS: It is poor that it is up to me to get names of JCC reps but no reason to think they can't cope. Contact me if not happy - it's important I represent you if the JCC is not working.

Nick Anstead: What bodies are making these changes?

SS: Faculties decide about teaching arrangements. Conference of colleges discuss direction of policies. The committee I sit on never discusses it. People in faculties decide to implement things.

Damian Jenkins, St Hugh's: Colleges are autonomous - will there be a difference in education?

SS: Yes

Chris Hanretty, St Anne's: Will you lobby for representation on senior tutors committee?

SS: yes, but doubt it'll be successful. Will encourage JCC chairs to put it on website.

Josh Goodman, Balliol: Any evidence that this is from student demand?

SS: Spoke to philosophy - didn't say. Said was teaching not resource driven.

Damian Jenkins: Will you ask JCRs to mandate the presidents to write to Senior tutors committee?

SS: Yes

**Friendly amendment prop Rodrigo Davies: Add believes 5: "That the tutorial should remain the main method of teaching at Oxford".**

**Add resolves 4: "To support the retention of tutorials as the main method of teaching at Oxford."**

MTV Hinesh Rajani: this isn't contentious

Jack Clift, CCC: it is a controversial amendment

Passes

**Motion passes.**

---

Motion 8 - GATS prop Katy Higgins

**Amendment adds figures to motion**

Katy Higgins: GATS is an agreement with the WTO. Read the Ethics report - HE is in scope of the agreement - massive implications. Will apply market principles to HE. Make it meritocratic, we should all be opposed to it. Government HE subsidies are seen as favouring national over international - need to reduce funding. This encompasses all the issues students are campaigning on at the moment. Has implications on academic freedom. V big, and not being discussed in parliament.

Hinesh Rajani: Is this the same as the top up fees motion?

KH: no, this is an international trade agreement.

Matt Sellwood: Will ethics committee and f&f work together?

KH: yes

MTV: **Motion passes.**

---

## Motion 9 - Iraq prop Matt Sellwood

Ali Richardson: proposes to move it to next Council. We need to wait for UV ruling for informed debate.

Andrew Copson: This motion only asks us to consult JCRs. Don't need a ruling on the resolutions.

MTV fails.

Matt Sellwood: Covered lots of issues earlier. This motion is not a debate on the war. This is purely about taking motions back to colleges to consult them properly. I'm told this makes it vulnerable but I believe in it. There is no subterfuge, it is just enabling the motion to be taken back and discussed. Will says most students agree with him about international issues so let's find out. Discuss the war in 5th week - vote now for consultation.

Nick Anstead: Is it true that you are still entitled to bring the motion in 5th week?

MS: Yes but would prefer it to be taken back to colleges.

MTV: Edd Southerden: we've debated this once already.

Ryan McGhee: We have wasted 3 hours of Council already.

41-21-1 - fails by 1 vote.

Andrew Thomas: This motion is not contentious. The motion is happening in 5th week. Let's move on.

Catherine Wallis: This was discussed in Keble - it was decided that it wasn't appropriate to bring it to Council or JCRs - we are mandated to vote against it.

Daniel Harkin, SEH: In the past I have always voted with my college for students as students, but I'm a pacifist and a quaker - nothing is more important than war and peace and this affects us all. However apparently I have a mandate to vote against any motion regarding war on Iraq. So in keeping with the precedent set by my JCR president in the Life motion, I'd like to say I find this "morally repugnant" and would like to declare my support for the Iraq motion and the motion in hand, in spite of my vote.

Ryan McGhee: This was discussed at Prescom. We feel this is inappropriate. 20% of my freshers are American, it is not right to discuss international issues. There are more relevant issues. Any letter would only end up in the bin.

MTV Katherine Radice: let's vote

Matt Sellwood: Want to say more

fails

Ali Richardson: SEH has mandated me to write to the OUSU president. This is making a mockery of what OUSU does well, it undermines OUSU.

Hinesh Rajani: insulting to presidents to think they are not asked. Opposed to developing foreign policy.

Damian Jenkins: we discussed this at prescom and we will not debate it.

Andy Garlick: This is offensive to me. Not just JCRs. 30% are Graduates, lots are international students.

**Friendly amendment prop Matt Sellwood - change JCRs to Common Rooms**

MTV Damian Jenkins: we have policy already  
Matt Sellwood: lots more want to speak.  
fails

Jane McTaggart: it is very upsetting to say that consulting brings OUSU into disrepute. easier to go back to JCRs. not all americans like the war.

Andrew Copson: there are also delegates, exec and campaign votes. prescom is not part of OUSU. This is a university student union.

Owen English, St Catz: This is offensive to say that I only care about things that affect oxford directly and not about the lives of other people. Students as students still have opinions.

Sean Sullivan: This shouldn't pass just for consultation. If the motion is not as oxford students, we shouldn't bother consulting JCRs. We should decide now whether this is relevant to students.

Peter Morton, Somerville: It is shameful that people don't understand the agenda. This has already been put to the end. If they don't care they can walk out of Council.

Conor O'Neill: Expel Damian Jenkins from Council. Has had 2 warnings. Heckling constitutes harassment.  
Damian Jenkins demands vote  
37-20-1 fails

Ali Richardson - prop motion of no confidence in chair  
Withdrawn  
Damian Jenkins: apologises

MTV Will Straw: we all know how to vote  
James Lazou: It has been very one sided  
39-18-3 fails

Katherine Radice: This motion does not mandate presidents, it encourages them. If you don't want to, don't put the motion to your JCR. I love prescom but it is only an informal discussion - its results don't matter here.

Tracy Ruscoe, St Hildas: This risks alienating people. Official Oxford opinion alienates people.

Nick Anstead: If we believe it is the right of any person to bring a motion to Council, it is discourteous to fail this motion. I don't want to vote ultimately without knowing what my JCR thinks.

James Lazou: this is making a mockery of OUSU - means it is an unrepresentative institution

Erin ..., Wadham: Saying we can't debate this because we might offend Americans is stupid. I am American. We have official OUSU opinion on lots of things. OUSU and oxford are not the same. We are privileged to have this education, and it is our responsibility to take decisions like these.

Helen McCabe, St Hildas: It is alienating to not let people discuss this.

MTV Chris Sullivan: no new ideas  
Ros Dampier: There are  
passes 41-6

Matt Sellwood: Sorry to Andy Garlick - have rectified mistake. Thought this would be simpler - tell me easier ways to do something like this. This is just an enabling motion - every member should be able to decide. Didn't think this would be controversial.  
It is outrageous to suggest we cannot campaign on other stuff. If you want to throw away the tradition of student campaigning then vote it down.

Hinesh Rajani: This is insulting - JCR presidents should not talk to members. We shouldn't make foreign policy.

Edd Southerden: point of order: this motion is not about international issues.

### **41 - 12-3 motion passes**

---

AOB

Will Straw: please stand for elections

Round of applause for Conor O'Neill for chairing

Round of applause for Julia Buckley for taking the minutes

Wadham bar open.