

OUSU 4th Week Trinity 2005 Extraordinary Council

Dan Simpson Balliol: Extraordinary Council, so only one motion under discussion

John Blake: Procedural motion to suspend the relevant parts of the standing to allow amendments that will substantively change the motion.

Passed nem con

John Blake: The reason we've held this meeting and the accepting of all amendments is so that we can reach any conclusion necessary in order to express our views. The ones on the sheet are quite good, but anyone who wants to amend it should feel free to do so now.

SFQ: Make up of proposed board of trustees?

John Blake: Should be alumni from the business world and presumable also civil service. People who have major experience of running large non-academic institutions.

SFQ: What is proposed at the moment as selecting board of trustees?

JB: At the moment high people within university will draw up list to present to congregation. When a trusteeship falls vacant trustee ship proposes name to congregation. Suggestions that council may also be able to suggest names.

SFQ: How voted on library amendment in congregation?

JB: To strike down compulsory joint reviews, to suspend discussion of green paper until November.

SFQ: Reasons for split between trustees and academic council and who has ultimate power?

JB: Same charities legislation affecting us will also affect university. When legislation implemented in 2007 university will require people to be charity trustees. Idea is they will be separate from academic. As board of trustees would have absolute power, but idea that congregation would have ultimate say. Board of trustees outrank Council.

SFQ: What is meant by institutional governance?

JB: Decisions as to what "financial envelope" was, avoid financial and reputation risk. Managers of money and give money to academic council. Buildings would be joint discussion.

SFQ: Currently OUSU has observer status at Council. Status at board of trustees?

JB: Have asked V-C, no representation at board of trustees but full student members of Council.

SFQ: Full members means voting members?

JB: Yes, needs that needs to be defended very strongly.

SFQ: Checks on board of trustees?

JB: Difficult to say. They give sum total of money to academic council, not clear who would make decision if trustees wanted to put large sums of money in trust fund. V-C floated idea that congregation could withdraw and sack trustees.

SFQ: What problem are these changes trying to solve?

JB: After North report review needed. Great driving force behind dividing governance is changes in charities legislation.

SFQ: Is the University definitely legally a charity?

JB: Yes.

SFQ: Expand on information on academic governance split between colleges and university.

Linsey Cole:find out what she said.

SFQ: Is formation of a single academic council paving way for central admissions?

JB: Opinion judgement, difficult to say.

SFQ: Will individual colleges lose any powers. Will just have to go through academic council to change fees and libraries?

JB: No, colleges are only bound by peer pressure.

SFQ: If new proposal over fees or student numbers, will it now have to just go through academic council instead of council and congregation of colleges?

JB: Yes, brings decision making together. At the moment departments and colleges negotiate to reconcile different needs. Now would all meet together.

SFQ: Requirement about board of trustees?

JB: Would need to be separate.

SFQ: Possible to just have council where could all be trustees? Separation not necessary.

JB: Unlikely as HEFCE will regulate, and in practice they say governing bodies should be made up of majority of externals.

Ne - slip of amendment. Various sections of the university that deal with provisions for student services - support in non-academic ways. Linsey has done work towards study skills. They are located all over the place and need to be brought together to mean that they can co-ordinate better. There is some opposition and some opposition in the University. There are some provisions within the report that ask for this but it needs to be a group that have the admin function as well. We should ask for an accessible joint location, which is a more long-term aim. Equal opps - 2002/3 they got rid of a lot of committees including childcare etc. this was intended to make the issues be talked about centrally but this doesn't happen. If we had all of these committees it would be more efficient and quicker and could feed into the academic council.

Ds - opposition? Allow sfqs

Or - can you outlie student aid office?

Ne - the previous assessor had the idea of dealing with financial aid. The proposal has fallen by the wayside and the current assessor doesn't know anything about this.

Is - how receptive will the university be to the disabilities committees etc?

Ne - more likely to be receptive to disabilities given they have a legal obligation. The structure within the green paper allows for these committees

Ed mayne - what would be the proposed increase in cost and power? An increase in cost?

Ne - would only be an increase in staff time but would be more efficient and pay off. If the university upped funding then they may be able to have more money to spend in those areas.

Mike Somerville - who would sit on committees?

Ne - smaller - the people that are directly involved in these issues. Take the people with the expertise and bring in some slightly more outside people that have good information. If anyone needed to bring in an expert they could go to these committees rather than council. We should also seek student representation on all of these committees.

Mb - what would the religious one be there for?

Ne - anything where there would be no issues - prayer rooms, provision of food, exam timings etc. the uni has been considering whether it should provide its own prayer room and no-one is willing to take it on as their issue. That would be where it was discussed?

Is - remit of student services comm?

Ne - would co-ordinate the student services. Make them a department and would be responsible for running that department. They are the ones that would be in control of the budget. They would also be in a good position to make sure student welfare issues went to academic council.

Simon clarke - do we think full childcare committee needed?

Ne - yes. Doesn't need a lot of people, just who is relevant. Could have an adhoc meeting but no-one there to call meetings.

Sc - under student services?

Ne - would have to ask for childcare officer etc?

Or - do we have a childcare officer?

Ne - we have someone whose responsibility it is to look after childcare

Is - what is the advantage of ressing for joint location.

Be - so people know where things are. Would be able to send them to one place where everyone is so that whoever they need is there not in another part of the uni. Will also make them work together.

Ej - did you consider international students and mature students committees?

Ne - I am less clear what the remit of a mature students committee would be and loathe to ask for lots of committees?

Ds - speeches in debate?

Loc - move to vote on amendment

Ds - any opp? Next. To add to believes...

Ca - there should be representation on committees - gives us a free card on this.

Ne - where would the reps come from?

Ca - ousu would select them or elect them and send them.

Ds - any opp?

Passes

Ds - to add believes....appropriate gender balance

Ca - section in green paper says that there should be an appropriate gender balance. It would be more important to have a good gender balance on the other committees created, not just the board of trustees. Should

Ed mayne - implying system of positive discrimination.

Ca - they have identified a need to address gender imbalances but they need to look into issues on other committees - needs a good balance but no quotas.

Tp - a lot are representational committees so how is it able to have a balance given that people hold offices?

Ca - they just need to make sure that they realise why they wanted a gender balance

Loc - how many female members on epsc?

Ca - no

Loc - I am the only member.

Jb - only 3 people on uni council.

Is - is the amendment just saying that there is nothing soocial about the trustee board.

Ca - just that there should be consideration

Bw - the board of trustees are non-academics and the council are academics - how would we deal with this?

Ca - something that should be considered.

Ds - any opp?

Ne - clear difference between the board of trustees as external as there are enough people into the world. In terms of the committees that were in my amendment, its just a group of people with the expertise and information to discuss the issues. Academic council very different to the board of trustees?

Jb- the point chris makes is a good one. The point is if we think its important enough to have women on the baord, we should say that this is a good idea for all of the committees and throughout the system. In the event that the experts are not women, not forced to have women but we should also be aware of exactly why it is that we cannot fill academic council with women.

Tp - reinforce points. The people are appointed by colleges - college level. Expertise - they are people whose jobs are relevant. In other universities this gender balance is used I political terms - used in appointing people. Risks given political weapons to people.

Ca - alternative wording - just o consider the principles. This is just saying that we should consider the principles. We are not putting quotas, we should look at why linsey is only person on epsc etc. new wording for amendment - "gender balance of academic council should also be considered."

Is - I don't think we need to worry about this. It is ust about saying gender balance should be an issue. It doesn't mean quotas, just that it should be kept in mind.

Jb: mtv

No opp, passes

Ds - amendment by peter hughes add resolves 6 to stress the importance of formal checks on the powres of thre board fo trsutess -

Ph - self explanatory. Checks are informal and this is just to say that there are formal checks in place.

Accepted as friendly

Ds - amendment - "notes that the propsoals in the green paper gives students representation on academic council etc.

Jb: accept as friendly

Td - what do you think of the prop to have all trustees elected by academic council? What do you think about corpus proposal that they should be academic at other unis? What is the legal role of the trustee? What is it that eill happen to cong?

Jb - trustees must be ultimate authority on everything eg sabbs and exec trustees of ou su.

Possible that certain powers reserved from trustees. Congregation remain unchanged except power to pick trustees. Only academics from other unis - good part but there are reasohn that we are seeking external trustees for example the business sides of the university. Having the ability to consult with mre people that have information external to the uni good. Directly elected by council - good idea.

Ne - don't think good idea. The whole reason that these thibsg jave been separated is that we need experts for these matter. If we think that isn't thre case we should oppose the changes in splitting the academic side and financial side. No point in a smaller group of academics.

Or - how does r5 match what hefce want us to do?

Jb - it does. If we did nothing and hefce became the charities legislator, then they wouldn't be happy with not half.

Ds - add to believes - graduate representation...

Jb - accepted.

Ds - add believes 8. Oppose board self selecting and ensure process of appointment overseen by cong.

Or - does that include making recommendations to cong?

Tp - aim of amendment to stop them doing what they want to do of the vicechancellor appointing whoever he wants. At the moment they are saying it will ahev to go through congregation but am

worried that they will propose a name to congregation with no coicve. Could be a system of even direct election whereby someone else puts forward recommendations meaning that they can't propse who they want.

Loc - who would nominate trustees?

Tp - if people want to amendment fine. Eg - at LSE separate committee appointed by congregation which sits down and works out who to pout forward. Ensures that trustees aren't recommending own successors. Reject idea of selfselection

Ne - needs to be clarified.

Tb - doesn't sound radically different to what is already there. By putting I a clarified amendment then we are making a strong statement.

Mb - proposal for selecting entire board of trustees not just the percentage from within the uni.

Tp -yes.

Ne - move into debate as none factual.

Ds - debate

Td - make more specific - all directly elected by council or congregation and those people nominated by the body electing.

Tp - trustees not be self-selecting and then propose as a separate amendment. So we can have a preferred model as well.also to support a board of trustees that is accountable to congregation.

Ds - any objection

Ne - should take out in any way.

Tp - that's fine.

Ds - objection?

Ca - don't agree that it shouldn't be self selecting. We want a board that knows what is going on. They will no what skills they need to have on the board or that they need to replace if someone leaves. We are trusting them to have powers

Jb - point is that tom's amendment doesn't say anything about the method. It will risk becoming a clique. We should pass tom's amedment and then discuss how they are chosen.

Mtv called - no obj

Sip tp - says that we don;'t want self perpetuating clique and also want them to be accountable to congregation, as supreme body.

Sio ne - what we need to say is that congregation should have a full veto. It is unclear and could be used in a variety of arguments, as it is not necessarily us that are proposing it and they will not necessarily understand how we wanted it to be argued.

Amendment passes.

Ds - new amendment

Td - "to considier it to be of the utmost importance that the trustees should all be elected by ac or congregaion. Nominated by the same body....." fundamental - if there needs to be trustees they will have absolute power and we need as much democracy as we can.

Ba - trustees not limited by terms of the trust so don't have absolute power.?

NE - So suggesting external people recommended by congregation?

TD - Composition is separate, but as I understand it can't all come from congregation.

TP - Saying that a binding nomination process whereby a member of congregation can always nominate?

TD - Needs to be restricted somehow, but ultimately where nominations should come from.

NE - Accept adding "and should not be limited to members of congregation or academic council"?

Td - Yes.

TB - So would permit external?

NE - Yes

JB - Quotas set separately to how select.

EJ - Don't have clause 50% from academic community?

NE - Yes, this makes clear not all have to be. This says not asking for direct election from amongst academics.

Nicky's amendment as accepted.

TP - What worries me is that this amendment undermines the power of congregation. Add something about congregation always having final say?

TD - Does say that prefer congregation

TP - Ok

JB - Congregation would ultimately have to confirm whoever was chosen.

CA - Budget this size needs to be chosen by specialists. Self-perpetuating works in big companies. Congregation aren't going to do much research into who is appropriate.

JB - Currently all the members of university council are elected. If want external expertise there is value in that, but nominations for university council are rarely opposed. Need to have a situation to avoid some ridiculous being nominated. Having a certain number of people coming from outside provides expertise. I think more democracy is good.

BW - I don't share John's love of democracy. I'm worried that congregation would select someone silly. Need to be competent, not political.

??? - At the moment congregation have to approve board of trustees anyway, gives them veto power. Congregation not in position to make decision. Veto power reasonable.

MTV

Opposition.

BW - Heard different sides.

NE - Something in amendment needs clarification. People have different conceptions about what we're deciding to do.

TD - Same principles apply to university as OUSU. I think we should have at least as much faith in academics to make decisions as university students. Underestimates political awareness of dons. This is not just management consultants, this is not value free, there will be judgement calls being made.

TP - I'm not anti-corporate. I don't think a corporate model is suitable here, this is a university and about academia. This is a community which has changed over the last 700 years but learning and academic study is the centre of what we do here. Should be a situation where academics who form university committee decide what the university does. Enormous power, deciding academic spending.

NE - Are we saying that any member of congregation can put someone forwards to be a trustee?

TD - Yes

NE - Then I oppose this. It took someone coming in from outside to say the things that needed saying about university and colleges. Compromise measure is to allow board of trustees to put forwards nominations and congregation choose. Otherwise could elect a group of people who are not qualified to do the job.

TB - I think if you have a body which puts forwards names, then presumably it only puts forwards as many names as there are places so no real election. As will have great powers it is important that they are elected.

JB - Tom is absolutely wrong. This is not about electing accounts staff but the people who will fundamentally be in charge. If we did create this board of trustees congregation won't pick people who are stupid, will pick people with experience. By dividing like this keep external members out of the bit we don't want to and in the bit we do, but need to hold to account.

LC - I agree fully with Tom Packer. Need to make sure congregation is always as fully consulted as possible, so that needed change can move through quicker.

CA - The green paper may not be perfect but tried very hard to set out difference between academic and other matters. Very clearly states in Green paper that trustees cannot interfere with academic matters. If have a group of experts with clearly defined remit choosing it then will make right choice.

TD - Veto is not democratic power, can only choose to wreck it. In OUSU sabs are trustees, and need to be elected. May say in Green paper that trustees can't overrule on academic matters, but under the law trustees have absolute power. HEFCE thinks that it's highly unlikely we won't have trustees, need to decide how to choose them.

MTV

TB - Other things to discuss with other amendments.

??? - Still more to say.

22-10-0 MTV passes

JB - Veto is nuclear option and automatically creates confrontation. Other parts of university deeply concerned about democratic nature of trustees. Will eventually have to compromise, but democracy is a long tradition here and should hang onto it.

NE - Holding onto tradition is naïve and a bit childish. If you want accountability then want a veto on posts, and vetos on decisions. Just because elected doesn't make things good. If genuinely believe in democracy should oppose splitting of academic and board of trustees. Not say we want two bodies where one elects other. No good electing people who don't have the skills who then do something incompetent. Not the way to ensure democracy or expertise.

24-10-2 Passes

Amendment (with lots of striking find out what it was)

Anne-marie - Last amendment established need for democracy but power structures not clear.

Claire Chalmers (University) - hefce want it to be 50% or more?

Tom Packer (St Cross) - this changes nothing except that we support a majority of academics.

?? - would hefce accept other unis academics as external?

Tom Dale (Corpus Christi) - couldn't it be the case that they were not on the board of another university but were an academic?

John Blake (St Hughs) - if we are in favour of this then against hefce. Might be useful for us to lay out policy beyond what we expect to get. Its possible to get the other things but not this.

Hannah Crowther (Balliol)- quorum count.

10 votes, quorum counted.

Not quorate, take a break

Nicky Ellis (Queens) - move to vote

Dan Simpson (Balliol) - clarification of amendment....

Sip anne-marie: democracy has been raised before. Concerned that they will have final power and having academic power good.

Mtv no opp.

John Blake (St Hughs) - essential that we stand up and have some policy on it. Lays out clearly

what the students will want. Useful policy to have and use to argue against the uni.
Nicky Ellis (Queens) - what we ask for goes against the green paper so we should vote for green paper to be gotten rid of.
Passes.