

OUSU Council- Michaelmas 3<sup>rd</sup> Week, 2008

Chair: Martin Nelson

Minuting: Rachel Cummings

MN: judgement I've given a ruling on at the back regarding an emergency motion. Also election of fee working party into agenda. Changes in order to motions, nothing substantial. There is no emergency motion, but the one that might have been is about mandates of NUS delegates. Matters arising from minutes? No.

Ratifications in Council

Lewis Iwu: Explanation of OSSl. Need to ratify directors report and financial statements, and re-elect the auditors- deliote as our audits

MN: Any questions?

LI: No, so company meeting closed, ratifications passed.

Madeline Stanely (RO): Electoral ratifications. Same as every other year, about expenditure limits changed, no postal votes, slight changes to definitions. Everything else is the same. Any questions? Any objections? No.

MN: Seeing none, ratification occurs. Now elections, so cede chair to RO

MS: Will take nominations for any of the positions now, because not sufficient publicity. Anyone want to run for the exec positions.

(No nominations)

Eliot Goland: So what happens to these positions?

MS: We'll elect next term with rest of exec, but can nominate for council in 5<sup>th</sup> week. Any nominations for Deputy Returning Officer?

(Two, they come to the front)

RO: do speeches

Sanjay (Peters): From Peters, running because thinks will enjoy, wants to help ousu, will uphold values of transparency and \_\_\_\_\_. Previous ousu experience: complaints committee, international students campaign welfare officer, in peters using the OUSU online software

Stephen Goodman (New): New, no political, new kicked out of council. Think it's important positions are filled. Thinks elections should be fair, and open, but doesn't think need to say anything else.

Rob Barham (LMH): Member of any uni political parties?

Both: NO

Lewis: What most important ruling from last year's elections?

SN: Didn't follow last elections that much. So can't say one ruling in particular, but did receive important perspectives from last year. Thinks now going to very different, because online, ro and dro positions going to be quite different. If am elected will give highest commitment to the job.

SG: Don't know enough, but think the disqualification of ballots important. Doesn't think should be an issues this year because online.

Rob BARham (LMH): Spirit or letter of law

SN: Spirit, but that evolves from letter, so not entirely different.

SG: Have to weigh both, just what seems sensible. So spirit but not at the expense of the letter.

RO: NUS extraordinary conference delegates

Lewis: Explanations of the positions

RB: What day of the week?

Lewis: Wednesday

People who nominated: Paul Dwyer (OUSU), Joel Mullan (SPC), Sarah Hutchinson (Stx), Elliot Goeland (Pmb),

RO: please also write down on ballot paper Dominic Williams (Stx) and Hannah Thompson and RON. Asks all candidates to speak, then I will read statement from candidates who can't be here.

Sarah Hutchinson: Labour, Co-operative, Fabian Society, never thrown out. Think important Oxford is elected nationally

Benjamin Kindler (Mansfield): SWP and Abortion Rights. Should oppose these reforms, will shift power to small group who can't be held to account. Shouldn't have increase in fees, stand up to government.

Paul Dwyer: Labour, in favour of reforms, think it's important that they get passed. He's been to NUS things before, knows he can get through it.

Joel Mullan (Peters): Labour, never been expelled. Also supporting the reforms, think the far left has too great influence in NUS and these reforms will help engage will ordinary students more.

Dan Rawnsely (Keble): SWP, revolutionary socialist, was NUS delegate last year, is committed and dedicated. Is british youth rep for woodcraft folk which works with

organisations inc NUS. Opposes the reforms, thinks students should run the NUS, unions live and breath in democracy.

EG (Pmb): NO national political affiliations, no motions of censure, never been thrown out. Was elected last year went to two NSU conferences, understands current constitution and proposed changed. Broadly in favour of proposals.

Hannah Thomson (Hildas): No political, never thrown out, against the proposals. Wants to represent OUSU.

Dom Williams (st Catz): SWP, never censured, no coned or sent out of OUSU council. Been to two conference and will vote against reforms.

Questions:

Sam Wheeler (LMH): Not enough women and this is Gender Equality Week. How can we change this?

SH: Yes problem, Gender Equality Week is important to change these kinds of things

BK: Yes a problem, in SWP we have forums on women's liberation, but not quotas

PD: Yes problem, support encouraging more people.

JM: Yes is a problem, if you look around the room, the imbalance is unbelievable in this meeting so we have to make it more a done thing for women to get involved, a more open culture. Standing up here can be intimidating

DR: Yes of course an issue. But don't think the problem doesn't start at university, begins at birth, because society is patriarchal. Society tells you to conform, so important OUSU encourage people of any minority to stand, but important that we look at the wider world, raise these issues in liberation campaigns of NUS

EG: is an issue, difficult to get people involved in the first place. The reforms good for gender experience.

LI: Oxford quite a reputation in NUS, if we voted later in favour of reforms would you then vote against them despite that.

BK: It would be against my conscience to vote for something think is bad for students

PD: Think it's important to stick to council mandates. Willing to go along with the majority.

JM: Will hold a mandate

DR: Elections should be as wide as possible, these reforms should be in a referendum in a student body. I've stated what I think, so wouldn't have a problem breaking mandate

EG: I wouldn't vote against a council mandate, unless it was totalling ridiculous.

SH: Would follow any mandate. That represents all students, have responsibility to them.

RB: Are you a member of OU political parties

PD: NO

JM: OULC

DR: No

EG: NO

SH: OULC

BK: Socialist Students

MS: Any nominations for the fee working group?

PD: Explanation of the group. This is for the open places.

MS: Please write down the name of these people on the back of your ballot papers. Do you want to hear a hust? (No)

Names: Jake Matthews, Stefan Baskerville, Sam Wheeler, Jonny Medland, Dani Quinn

JM (peters): no censured, no national political organisations. Want to run because I looked into how the oxford opportunity bursary is administered, no happy with differences between the years. People in years below me get more money, so want to bring this view into the group.

SB (univ): Labour, no toe everything else. I want to be involved because I hope to be involved next year if I get to be president. Having spoken to John Denham, about fees review, by that point we need a position for our students, I want to be as informed as possible and all the options.

SW (LMH): Labour, running because I'm running to be paul's deputy next term, but because this is about values and the uni chancellor have been making comments this term. Chancellor saying Oxford should do what ever it does, but I think Oxford is public good, public institution. If have tuition fees at all they should be as low as possible. Fees make a market, and then people who can't afford it so they won't go. That should never be a decision people have to make.

JM (Queens): LibDem, no to everything else. Funding HE is really important issue, must have the right policy in place. I was JCR pres last year. Worked at think tank last year and was looking at this kind of thing, learnt lots about it.

Dani Quinn (Merton): No to everyone. HE funding is obsession for me, extremely important that we know how we should pay and what we are getting. I'm really interested in this issue, really interested in being in the group. Am an economist.

PD: Purpose is to look at all the options. Are you happy to look at all views, so council can have the debate, put your own views aside.

JM: Yes, can put personal issues aside, will speak to other people, friends

SB: Yes, will represent other people's views

SW: Yes, lets have lots of discussion.

JM: Yes, that's the point.

DQ: Yes

DR (Keble): Should we learn from Europe, is free education possible?

SB: Yes possible, unlikely. Almost inevitable that we'll have some kind of fee, so we need to work within the constraint to find as fair a funding system as possible. Political realities, given state of the economy. Idea of bringing back grants is a long way away from where we are.

SW: Education is never free, so who should be paying for it. IS about the benefits-benefits of the individual or for society, government fudged it so both pay a bit. Government wanting more people in HE. IS it more equitable for more people going to uni, and pay or less people go and no pay.

JM: Yes if it's possible in other countries can happen, but very unlikely that it's going to happen. About us being taken seriously, should lean to one that has some chance of happening.

DQ: We'll discuss it like any other options.

Jack Matthews: Would be good, might not happen.

RB: Political organisation in the university?

Jack Matthew: OUCA

SB: OULC

SW: OULC

JM: OULD

DQ: None

MS: Election for JCC

Lewis: Explaining that JCC is a listening and advice forum for the university. We run all our papers through the university. Good experience if you want to put papers through your college. One space only for graduates. Anyone want to nominate.

Two nominations:

MS: Elections first for graduate only positions.

(disorder)

MS: Give name, declarations, why you want to do this

SH (Stx): Labour, no to everything else. Currently grad welfare rep on OUSU, OUSU part time exec in first year. Think important grad interested rep in OUSU and uni. Different needs and these often get overlooked. I've worked closely with Grads over last few years and want to carry on.

Alex Priest (SJC): NO to everything. <PLS divisional rep, am scientists, hoping to represent graduates next year. Want more experience. Representation is very important. E.g. issues like graduate fees, open.

RB: Any ox uni political parties

Sarah Hutchinson (Stx): OULC

Alex Priest (St Johns): No

MS: Vote now. Nominations for the two other positions, you can stand again. (two other persons joined). Won't hear the other people who just

Ian Lyons (Teddy Hall): No to everything. Clinical medic, dphil here, divisional board, am scientist under-represented. Have seen lots about Oxford here, because under grad, grad and tutor so see from all three sides.

Kat Wall (LMH): LibDem, no to else, think undergraduate representation is most important thing we have. I try to do this on the OUSU exec but want to do it to the university. Something I want to get involved in over the coming months and years.

MS: Questions? (no)

Lewis: Talking about rules committee. Talking about the criteria.

RB (LMH): When does it meet?

LI: Something this term, probably during the day time. Proctors set the time.

Jack Wellby (OUSU/Jesus): How many spaces?

LI: Two general places

Peter Morcos (lincoln): What exactly does it do?

LI: All rules

Ben Pilgrim (somerville): Which rules?

LI: Everything apart from exams, so big jurisdiction.

MS: Any nominations? (four) Name, political

Jack Wellby (OUSU/Jesus): No political parties, no to everything else. Think it needs normal people to be sitting on this. Don't want geekiness in rules committee. Shouldn't be anal about things like trashing etc.

Joseph Wales (Hughes): No to everything. Academic affairs rep at hughes, and on music society. So coming from two perspectives.

Peter Morcos (Lincoln): No to everything. JCR pres last year, dealt with lots of things last year, uni doesn't like students to know their rights, I'm studying law and human rights, and if some of the things that the uni does, if government did it would be illegal.

Elliot Goeland (Pmb): Not to everything. Did run last time, but then two months later found out I wasn't eligible. Lots of things in the rules that don't make any sense, so want clarifications, work out what things mean, and need to change how things dealt with.

MS: Questions?

DL: Why were you ineligible

JW: Not been JW: Not Been PM: Not Been

EG: Because it was within my first three terms of university

(voting and collecting of ballot papers)

MN: Reports from Sabs

LI: Last week, Aldwych- sabs from Russel group student unions, believed that it was quite productive. Cherwell inaccuracies last year, have written to them. There were questions about the secrecy about finance person leaving, but it was because it is a HR issue which is confidential. Election happening this term, spread the word, shows we are a democratic organisation.

JW: Look at website

Adam Scott Tagart (wadham): Why we holding OUSU council in such a small room?

LI: difficult to get college venues, if you have possibilities come and tell me. We get kicked out if tutors want it at last minutes. Also, there is an A3 paper at the back, sign up if you want a sab to come into the JCR/MCR to talk about OUSU. Sign up, we'll send officers.

Rosanna McBeath (OUSU WEO): Sorry it's so short, have been ill

Rachel Cummings (OUSU VP Women): Gender Equality Week, thanks to everyone for coming to events, come later to the Union, student parents, Union event please tell people about it

Jack Wellby: elections for RAG, the quote got cut off

Dan Lowe (Teddy Hall): Give me voting cards back.

Sarah Hutchinson (stx): Mature Students Campaign is happening, they're hard to reach, if you have mature students do encourage them to come along.

MS: Have appeals to three of my regulations already, am forming JT.

Martin Nelson: My ruling on emergency motion has become very important now, (reads out ruling) says that this issues isn't an emergency. Does anyone want to change that ruling? (No) Passage of Motions Nem Con.

Motion 1 of ordinary motions, passed nem con

Motion 2 (student safety) passed nem con

Motion 5 passed nem con

MN: Move to first readings to amend the constitution.

John Mayer (Keble): We need to change the hustings, just because we've been doing something for a long time doesn't mean we need to do it for ever. Would be more interesting and more fun if we could ask each other questions. I've had the chair and the RO look it over. This isn't going to solve all the problems of engaging with students. Think though it'll encourage people to be interested.

JM (Queens): What does the RO disagree with?

MN: Disallow questions

KW: How prevent harassment and bullying

John Mayer :

Robert Barham: (speech in opposition) I object to council notes 1, don't think it is. Think this will open the election to abuse, more free less fair. Don't trust candidates. Think this is unnecessary in addition to college hustings and central hustings

MN: Going to debate

DQ: Just because some people like the hustings now, doesn't mean we shouldn't add to things now. Least like this it would be more interesting. Don't think just because it will be more free, necessarily less fair. Still RO can stop people can abuse or harassment people. It isn't inundating, just attracting people who wouldn't otherwise go.

Jonny Medland: Think this good idea, but want to hear from RO just in case there's a big problem I don't know about. Think this will get more people involved. This would be more illumination about the differences between the candidates. So want to know the problems from a technical point of view.

MS (LMH): This is a debate about whether we accept these into the Standing Orders. Reservations I have are about the way some people are intending them to be enacted, for this election. I don't have views about whether these changes are good or bad.

Eliot Goeland: Whilst I like a lot of this format, at the moment it mandates the RO to hold one alternative husting, which would include positions like NUS delegate, which doesn't attract a lot of interest.

SW: Good things in this proposal, but issues is nominations opened yesterday and now we are talking about changing the rules when elections already happening.

MS: Point of information- changes wouldn't happen til second reason

SW: Yes. But if people thought if these were good they should have brought them at some point since the last elections.

RB: I dispute the argument that these alternative hustings will encourage more people to come. People will realise is the same old boring OUSU.

John Mayer: It is important to separate the change itself to the way we are changing it. As it stands, this won't change these elections until termly council. ON changes themselves, people might realise it's the same old boring OUSU, but why don't we give it a shot? We could always change it back, if does work then can add to it. We can make this a better organisation if we open ourselves to a little change.

DL: important we don't think of these coming in right now. At the moemtn the candidates can't challenge each other. At the moment they get people to ask questions for them, and that's a bit cheeky, with these it would be better, less of cliquey ousu, would be more open:

Lewis Iwu: I think changes are good changes in general. Irrelevant about how they are changing now. Last year people tried to attack other candidates during the normal hust. Be more open to the general student population, students in general think this is a good idea. Timing of when these come about is irrelevant.

RB: Move to vote

MN: One last speech

Jay (New): What's the point of them additionally rather than replacing the general husts.

EG: We don't know how these are going to work.

John Mayer: (summary speeches) think this are good reforms, there is a general opinion that we should make things more interesting in husts, make it more open, rather than getting buddies to ask questions.

Rob Barham: Apologies to how mean I was to all the candidates. I oppose because don't think will make a substantive change. Still be an empty room that the candidates hust in.

Vote: Passed

Move to Motion 4

EG: Point of order- want to know which standing order the motion refers to

MN: Special Council is not in the SO but the constitution.

EG: Which standing order, does it refer to?

MN: About those referring to what we just passed. Explanation of special council. The only people who can vote in it are common room representatives. These people can only vote if they are mandated by their JCRs or MCRs. I will write the motion, and you will have a explanation and answer must be in my pidgeon hole by 11am in OUSU on the day before the special council. Special Council is the most powerful thing OUSU can do. So if what we just passed, if passed in the SC it would come into the Standing Order immediately.

Josh Warham (Merton): Can you send that out in an email?

MN: Yes. Also it has no quoram.

DL: When will you send this email out, deadline for motions at my common room is midnight tonight.

MN: If there are problems with deadlines, please tell them to phone me.

George Kingerston (St Annes): Second the problems with deadlines.

MN: There must be 14 days in between so you could have a mandates. Any more questions?

Jack Wellby: If called, can you put other motions into this meeting?

MN: No, only if you amended this motion.

EG: What would happen if the motion passed unamended?

MN: It has already been amended with the consent of proposer, to give two weeks, which allows it to be constitutional. My powers are to make council work. (No other questions)

Peter Morcos (Lincoln): (speech in pro-persision) You can change standing orders by an ordinary council vote and one at termly council or you can replace termly council with special council. So we could do special council just before central ousu husts, but if that's not ok we can find another time. We've said this is good in principle, and if this gets more people involved then we shouldn't be waiting around, we should just do it now.

MN: Short factual questions?

LI: (speech of oppositions) This is more a speech of guidance. Think, first, do you think this warrants a special council? We need to think whether JCR/MCR people are going to be represented. What precedent does this set? This would change something very near to the actual event, but fine if you think that's important. Also, think about effect on RO and DRO, they have lots to do, would be different.

MN: Move to debate or any SFQ?

RB: To chair: Isn't there a clause which basically stops this happening?

MN: No

Josh Monerham (Merton): Is there any precedent?

Madeline: I've looked through the last 8 years and haven't found any.

Adam Smith (Balliol): I agree the new idea is a good one, but don't think this is so urgent that it warrants a special council. Elections are so important, this interrupts the process.

MN: Not SFQ, confusion, whether this is debate

Jonny Medland (Queens): Is there any way there would be time for this to happen?

Adam Smith: (Continuing debate speech) concerned this turns into a political issues in the elections, don't think that's what we need right now.

DL: Whilst spirit of getting them through is a very good idea, is dangerous to change the rules when election has happened. People who already nominated haven't signed on for this, so not fair.

Jack Matthews: Agree to change the rules of the game while playing the game. If this was such an important issues, and had been seen as a problem from previous elections, why hasn't it been done earlier.

PD: IF this has been passed, then surely we should let JCR/MCR discuss this.

RB: Point of Information why can't they do it anyway

PD: Because it won't feed into this election.

Richard Bachelor (st annes): Have just passed a motion want to get the elections to be more open and informative, if we think so let's start now.

George Kinerston (st annes): yeah it is a change, but now a fundamental change, the candidates should be courageous enough to deal with this.

DQ: Elections important, we should let people get as much information as possible. This has come up in the media and makes OUSU look like is not open. Logistics is irrelevant, we've said we've already decided, so we might as well do it now. And about whether shouldn't do it during the elections, candidates are still the same, this just makes it fairer, not getting their friends to do it.

RB: If the motion fails at Termly Council can fail, so the MCR/JCR process undermines the general purpose.

MS: Article G 1 1 E, read it out. If you pass this, I won't be able to do anything about holding these husts until fridayy 5<sup>th</sup> and elections start Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> week. So you may have an alternative hustings, at 3pm in OUSU officers on a Sunday afternoon. Because can't take these into account when planning the election

EG: 48 hours notice

MS: No, now 24 hours

Eliot Goland: If that fails, then this can't be brought in 6 months time.

Martin Nelson (LMH): Not sure, we can check that.

Eliot Goland: So don't want to interrupt it coming in for the next time

DL: Could get in fro Trinity.

Josh Monagham (merton): IS important that this would be an election issue, so could we stop the candidates talking about this.

Madeline S (LMH): No can't really stop them. Theoretically could make a ruling on it, but not sure on what grounds.

Dan Lowe: Not count as raising profile?

Madeline S (LMH): Maybe if they wrote a newspaper article.

John Mayer: Logistical issues are important, so I have deliberately not put in a destination, so candidates have to do it, rather than Madeline. One of the reasons people don't like OUSU is because things take forever. Some things you need that to

happen. But if we wait it reinforces the idea that people have about OUSU being slow.

RB: Move to vote, and want a recorded vote.

MN: Vote for a recorded vote

RB: Can we have a debate about the recorded vote?

(everyone says: No)

Vote for recorded: 11 votes

Recession of council.

Peter Morcos: It's important to get these changes as soon as possible, show people we're doing something.

Adam Smith: They're a good idea, but they're not that good idea, they don't need a special council. Especially considering who is proposing, so will be taken as a campaign issue, worried it's going to take over the whole election process. Want the elections to be interesting, lots of event. These proposals aren't urgent enough to warrant all the fun.

MN: Vote, record.

MS: Say yes, no or abstain. IF you vote yes, we'll have this special council, if you say no, we won't the special council.

(recorded voting)

(adding up votes)