



Extraordinary Council Minutes

**Extraordinary Council
Tuesday 4th week, Michaelmas Term**

Chair: Rich Hardiman (OUSU/Greyfriar's)

The Chair welcomed everyone and explained that Paul Dywer couldn't be here. Rich explained the procedures for giving speeches and explained that he would be keeping a tight frame on timings – he had a stop watch and would be giving people strict time limits.

Speech in proposition

Martin McCluskey (OUSU/St Hugh's) gave a speech in proposition of the motion. He explained the context of the situation – last term a referendum was held to replace the VP Women with a Student Advisor. There was a motion prior to the referendum passed to have a review of the situation, but ten JCRs asked for a referendum and that occurred. There was still a mandate to have a review on this situation. There were still things not considered, and two meetings were held in July, deciding to take the suggestions of the review forward and have consultation. Another meeting took place in September – it became clear that a consensus wouldn't be reached. The Equal Opps officer asked for consultations to come from students. We have received seven submissions – these are all out now. This consultation is aimed to be clear and fair. We don't want to rush into a referendum – we want proper debate and a clear, transparent process. We can break down and analyse the opinions properly. This indicative poll mandates us to form the basis for a referendum – it just binds us to bring a referendum. The indicative poll is not a binding policy to bring about changes for the Student Advice Service.

Short factual questions

Stefan Baskerville (University): How will the results of the indicative poll be taken to the referendum?

Martin: the indicative poll will give us a basis to take forward options. e.g. if one suggestion was strongly supported, that one could go to the referendum.

Robert Barron (LMH): was Alistair Wrench on the Working party?

Martin: no

Mandisa Mbali (St Antony's): was anyone from a minority ethnic group on the party?

Martin: no

Speech in opposition

Johnny Medland (Queen's): doesn't like all the submissions, and therefore objects to the motion going through in full.

Debate

Martin: friendly amendment to get rid of submission 5 as it's the same as 1 (seconded by Claire Addison OUSU/Pembroke). Friendly amendment to remove submission 7 as this has been discussed already.

John Maher (Keble College): this indicative poll will be voted on by everyone. Before it was only voted on by women, so we should keep submission 7.

Kieran Hutchinson-Dean (Wadham): agrees with Martin and wants 7 to go – the vote showed that women were decisively against the submission, so not worth having the debate again. We need to make sure that women are happy with this decision. Advantageous not have too many options.

Martin McCluskey: seconds Kieran, and the policy of having a Student Advisor has been passed in Council. We're taking papers to JCC to seek funding for a Student Advisor. We should not be compromising our work for something that the

James Lamming (OUSU/Merton) move to vote on the amendment.

John Maher against voting.

Move to vote passed by clear majority.

Motion amended to strike 1 e and 1 g by a clear majority.

Hannah Roe (OUSU/Balliol) proposed an amendment (seconded by Rich McKay): Chair rules that the amendment is struck according to b 1 c c of the Standing Orders. This proposal should have been seen by the deadline.

5mins were given to look at the amendment and decide whether to try to overturn the Chair's decision.

There was objection to the Chair's decision.

Claire Addison took the Chair.

Rich Hardiman gave a speech in favour of not taking this amendment. Rules of Council state that anything which substantially changes the motion should be given the same timing – can't amend it to change this much. And there is an outstanding mandate which laid down the process of proposing submissions – this is a submission and should have been submitted according to this process.

Claire read the standing orders relevant.

Hannah Roe gave a speech in opposition to the Chair's ruling. She said she was surprised to see that this was not accepted. To strike the submissions as the amendment states. This is a useful composite of all the submissions that we have had. Wrote this after 12pm yesterday to be a useful way of holding an indicative poll. Current process is messy. Submissions are too long. Situation ridiculous.

Dani Quinn (Queen's): why was this not an initial submission?

Chair: qualified that Hannah couldn't answer, as at this point it is only short factual questions to the Chair relating to the clarification of the procedure. But added that we don't know.

Mandisa Mbali: Why weren't ethnic minority students consulted in this process?

Chair: repeated previous point, only clarification relating to the procedure allowed at this time,

Vote on Chair's decision

21 in favour of Chair's decision.

13 against.

Amendment failed.

James Lamming moved to vote on the motion.

There was opposition.

Speech in proposition of voting on the motion. James: submissions have now been decided and we should move to vote.

OJ (St Peter's): few things I don't agree with re ethnic minority students. problem with submission 2.

Vote on whether to move to vote:

13 favour to vote

9 against

10 abstentions

Move to vote failed.

Amendment to strike 1.

Mohsin Khan (Wadham): from LGBTQ Council who are against the submission as there is one person to go to for welfare and campaigning currently. Access and Equal Opps would not work. Should definitely be a woman in the SAS – status of women also affects gays and homosexuals. LGBTQ Council supports retention of VP Women.

James Lamming speech in opposition. This is to decide the submission of motions, not to decide on whether we agree on each submission. This is a process motion, to decide on the submissions. None of the options are perfect – this does require thought from the students in Oxford.

Ben Carlin (New College): James is right – this is to decide that students should decide.

Mandisa Mbali: Ethnic Minority students not consulted and should be consulted first.

Kate Howells (Wadham College): support the amendment. this is relevant here. pointless to have this discussion.

Johnny Medland (Queen's College): was in Council and this came out of LGBTQ Council, the chair of LGBTQ Council was in the working group. Lack of BME Students is a shame, but they could have stood. Abolishing VP Women – strong opinions. Most of these submissions abolish VP Women. Should not be voted on by such a small group.

Hannah Roe: we have to look very carefully on what was going on the working party group – quoted this group's report. In opposition to the access & equal opps, welfare link would be broken.

Kieran move to vote – everyone knows what to vote.

14 wanted to vote.
15 against.
6 abstentions.

Ingrid Frater (OUSU/St Hugh's): this debate is not to decide on the merits of each submission. There are strengths and weaknesses of them all and it's up to the students to decide what they want. We should step back – believes that the Student Advice Service needs reform and don't want to see this get lost. We work very long hours and do not have the time to provide a good enough quality service. The process has been open and there are still two weeks before the indicative poll and months before any referendum to engage in consultation. We should keep the submissions and have lots of discussion.

James Lamming move to vote – Ingrid's speech said it all.

Hannah Roe wants to hear from James and Ingrid because she doesn't agree with their submission.

27 in favour of voting
3 against
7 abstentions

Amendment failed by a clear majority.

James Lamming move to vote on the motion.
Ready to vote on the motion – send it back to students.

Mandisa Mbali: would like more time for submissions.

24 in favour of voting
7 against

Speeches in proposition and opposition

Martin McCluskey gave a speech in proposition of the motion. Motion from Council said we need to have an Indicative Poll. Mandisa was packing up and Martin wanted to address her points. If the last sab team failed to consult with ethnic minority groups that was bad. Mandisa called out objections to the process and the Chair asked that she refrain from calling out during a closing speech, in accordance with the standing orders. Martin: This is a long process. Please feel that this is an ongoing process. Vote for the motion and let people decide.

Hannah Roe gave a speech in opposition to the motion. Not appropriate to say it was last year's sab team's fault. We want to hear from minority groups. Not be over-swamped by majority groups. Not enough minority groups involved. We need to hear from these groups and have more consultation. These proposals are not good enough.

30 in favour of the motion
7 against

2 abstentions

Motion passed.