

Hustings for candidates standing for election to the position of Vice President (Charities and Community).

Josefa Henry-Bochan (Wadham) and Lotte Tregear (Christ Church) are both present and hust in that order. The candidates are henceforth referred to as 'JHB' and 'LT' respectively.

Declarations:

JHB: I am a member of the Oxford University Conservative Association and Amnesty International.

LT: I have nothing to declare.

Speeches:

JHB: I have worked with charities, been president of a Bosnian orphanage organisation, raised £10,000. I have raised for Travel Aid and worked in a homeless shelter. I have been involved with KEEN, I have three years of experience. I have support from R.A.G., One World and charities workers. I think that there are difficulties with publications which is something I aim to improve. I will implement OUSU's policies on environmental issues including recycling and fair trade initiatives. I will focus on individual charities and raise awareness. I have the relevant experience for the job.

LT: I would encourage the involvement of freshers via a first year rep. I have been involved with Christ Church Thong Day. I am involved with KEEN, Mencap holidays. Been college society president, organising yearbook, marketing products. R.A.G.: Would raise profile, more publicity, rationalise fundraising via handbook and reps, raise sponsorship (including from corporations) and liase with charitable organisations of other universities. Plan bigger entz, raising OUSU and RAG profile. Improved communication, training, transferable skills. I am experienced and policy aware, the candidate for VP (C&C).

Questions to candidates:

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): You will be a V.P. of the union. Issues in addition to those just concerning RAG?

LT: Interested in the overall process of welfare issues.

JHB: Interested in the potential of students, amount of effort, motivating force, applies across board.

Dominic Curran (St. Hugh's): There is a disparity in terms time spent on RAG.

JHB: Co-ordinating students is important; I know people who can get involved, RAG job needs fundraising and I have the experience to do this.

LT: Transferable process, good to have someone who knows what its like to be involved with rag, experience as college rep.

Omar Salem (St. Hugh's): Co-ordination across the university is essential.

LT: I have less experience across the university, but have been involved with cross college societies, for example the Union. No problem in getting involvement.

JHB: University wide events can take place in addition to college events.

Shruti Uppal (St. Hilda's): What issues face RAG in Oxford, and how will you approach them?

JHB: With the exception of some very involved colleges there are some people who don't know it even exists. Charities committee will pass on information. It is the job of the OUSU sabbatical to arrange as many events as possible, to get people to give up more time and to provide opportunities.

LT: There are problems associated with the collegiate nature of the university. Can exploit college events, while holding university-wide events at clubs, better mixing. Not great history at Oxford so raise profile through OUSU.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): You would be a VP of the Student Union? What are your views on the *ultra vires* laws?

LT: I do not hold a particular view on those laws, will conduct more research. It is a serious issue that should be dealt with democratically - not just up to me.

JHB: U.V. law is irrelevant to this position. Something that should be discussed in Council, not really part of this job.

Peter Morton (Somerville): As well as integrating RAG into OUSU, you should consider issues from that other side too. What is your understanding of 'OUSU' issues, for example the delegates issue?

JHB: I am not involved with OUSU Exec, but especially for this position that is not important. Lots of work to integrate the two organisations, someone determined is needed to fulfil potential. I will focus on the issues.

LT: Not involved but I have commitment and drive.

Louise Radnofsky (University College): Are you happy with how charities are selected? Any thoughts on how it might be changed?

[Now referred to as 'LR (Univ.)']

LT: Divide up national, international and local charities. Not enough people involved in the nomination process, hence good idea to allow nominating via. website. OUSU connection will help with its publicity.

JHB: All happens in Trinity, no influence on which charities are selected. Publicise this; nominate charity. Division is good, highlighting certain charities, e.g. asylum makes people aware of charities.

Shruti Uppal (St. Hilda's): The job involves both charities and communities. Time commitments, how will this change? Influence on parts of job?

JHB: Lots to do but essentially fundraising is key, want to meet with the various committees and ensure dialogue with all people. Get to speak to more people and get them involved with fundraising.

LT: Lots of work: both that required by OUSU and RAG. Charities work may involve some delegation to rag reps. Important to keep people involved and informed.

Dominic Curran (St. Hugh's): The job is externally funded at the moment. This probably won't last. Ideas for finding alternative future funding?

LT: Very successful and so it will be long standing. Resources can be approached.

JHB: I work for lots of trusts so know about resources available. I will have a chat with the business manager.

Hustings for candidates standing for election to the position of Vice President (Graduates).

Marcus Walker (Oriol) is present and the only candidate. The candidate is henceforth referred to as 'MW'.

Declarations:

MW: I am a member of Oxford University Conservative Association and the national Conservative Party.

Speech:

MW: Well, needs must when the devil calls. I am running for Vice President (Graduates) because I am qualified. For I am a graduate, and I am a Vice President. As a graduate I know what could be done to get them involved in the JCR. I would fight for more money for this under-funded group that feels it has no voice. Perception of JCR dominance. Vote Marcus Walker, Oriol College.

Questions:

Chris Hanretty (St. Anne's): Post-Graduate Assembly?

MW: Post-Graduate Assembly?

Ali Richardson (St. Edmund's Hall): Are you involved in any other elections which may take up your time and not allow you to do your job?

MW: I am not permitted to declare candidature if I should decide to run in another place? I don't think it would have that much effect. It would raise the profile of VP (Graduates) and would be good to extend contacts. This would be a good thing.

Andy Garlick (Christ Church): Graduate consultative committees?

[Now referred to as 'AG (ChCh)']

MW: I would encourage communication and attend meetings.

Andrew Copson (Balliol): There are different types of graduate and this position has to cater for DPhil candidates. Do you think you will really be able to cater for them? Do you have scope?

[Now referred to as 'AC (Balliol)']

MW: I am taking a MSc at the moment. There are, yes, very different types of degree, and some don't know the system and have come in from elsewhere. But should be ok.

AG (ChCh): There are fifty faculties and at 2/3 times a term will you really have the time to attend all meetings?

MW: I don't know what the meetings do, but I would find out.

Sonia Sodha (St. Hilda's): Graduates tend to be more apathetic to the union. There are issues with ensuring that post-graduate assembly meets its quorum requirements. How would you go about increasing graduate attendance?

[Now referred to as 'SoS (St. Hilda's)']

MW: What does this body really do? It's not a question of apathy; I would ask graduates what they wanted assembly to do, no point in discussing things irrelevant to grads. If there is nothing to discuss then people simply won't turn up.

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): Are there issues with the student advice service and mature students?

MW: I will be nice, I will find out what is expected, and I will perform to the best of my ability. I will look at mature student groups with regard to their own needs. I will find out what is expected and I will do it.

Eleanor Thompson (Wadham): Are the needs of graduates met by the student union?

MW: No, but this can be looked at and changes made.

Will Straw (New): Suitability of a candidate that supported disaffiliation?

[Now referred to as 'WS (New)']

MW: That makes me more suitable than anyone in the 'OUSU clique'. Graduates don't take an interest, similar reasons for disaffiliation. I have actively campaigned from an outside perspective.

AG (ChCh): Funding issues for graduates?

MW: No funding, so situation difficult. Graduates are often working or relying on handouts from parents, further fees should fall.

Nicholas Cole (University): Do you have specific proposals for reform?

[Now referred to as 'NC (Univ.)']

MW: Issues with JCR and MCR working together, and difficulties of new people in college. Important to make people feel comfortable. OUSU discusses matters not relevant to graduates, so often a feeling that there's no need to be involved. Separate issues, so a division of labour and time.

Helena Puig Laraurri (St. Hilda's): Issues for international students?

MW: I know what it's like. I will provide mechanisms and give choice.

AG (ChCh): Should colleges be given further powers?

MW: Graduates are selected by faculties and this should stay.

Tom Goodhead (Magdalen): How would you deal with knives in your back?

MW: I have had many knives in my back. I am used to it.

5th Week Council

a. Minutes of the previous meeting

Objection: Laura McInerney would like her full surname noted.

b. Matters arising

None.

c. Ratifications in Council

OUSU Reps Committee: Dominic Curran.

RATIFIED

Elections committee: Matthew Eichardson (St. Peter's).

RATIFIED.

[Now referred to as 'MR (St. Peter's)']

Chancellor Statement

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): Why was this press released before it was ratified in Council?

WS (New): We wanted to get on and get candidates interested. One already was. We can change the statement if we want, but the Executive were asked to draft it. No one has signed it yet.

RATIFIED.

d. Elections in Council

Election for 7th week Chair of Council

Candidates were Nicky Ellis (Queen's), Daniel Roe (Balliol), Paul Afshar (St. John's), and the candidates husted in that order. Candidates are henceforth referred to as 'NE', 'DR' and 'PA' respectively.

NE: OUSU Council needs to be efficient, easy to understand and short. I have chaired Labour Club meetings and its TGM which are more volatile than Council. I can cope. I have been coming to OUSU for a long time and I know the procedure. I would like to have a go at chairing.

DR: I have chaired a national parliamentary procedures society. I think Council needs to be more accessible to those people outside OUSU Council. It needs improved efficiency. But political independence of the chair is key, and should have no OUSU affiliations. Which I won't.

PA: I have been to four terms worth of OUSU Council and have seen everything from censure to normal procedure, so I have experience. I am Secretary of the PPE society, I am independent, I bear no grudges. We need a larger room (ask St. John's?) for £10 a chair cant do much about length but they can keep chairing tight.

Questions to Candidates:

SoS (St. Hilda's): What do all candidates think about Council Bingo? Issue of appropriateness?

PA: No, not appropriate. It's intimidating and people shouldn't be intimidated. I agree

with what you said. But people change, and so if Nicky says it was wrong, then she should be able to stand.

DR: I would prefer not to see active playing as a part of council. What people do privately is fine as long as Council business is not disturbed.

NE: Yes, I played Council Bingo, but I'm not feeling penitent. However, if I was Chair then I would stop it. There are rules, and when you have to enforce them, you enforce them. Having been a loon, I know how their minds work. I would engage in no silliness at all.

Conner O'Neill (Wadham) : How loud can they shout "quiet"?

[Now referred to as 'Chair']

DR: Quiet.

NE: It is often more effective to say Shhhhhhh....

PA: I feel intimidated. I would buy a gavel. Shut up.

Peter Morton (Somerville): Have any of the candidates been OUSU officers before?

NE: Yes. I had hoped people wouldn't know who I was. I was on OUSU exec and then I resigned, and I don't think that will effect how I chair a meeting.

DR: I have not been involved politically in OUSU at all.

PA: I have done a lot. I have been an OUSU rep, produced Careers for Queers and yesterday I got married for an OUSU campaign.

Ali Richardson (St. Edmund's Hall): Do any of the candidates have political affiliations? Are any of them involved with F.E.D.A.?

DR: No, none.

PA: No.

NE: The Oxford University Labour Club, maybe the national Labour Party. I went to watch FEDA but I didn't participate. If you are an activist you believe in an impartial chair, and I will be one.

AG (ChCh): How many Councils have you attended?

PA: 4 terms worth (max)

DR: 3

NE: Most of them.

Ryan McGee (Pembroke): What is your personal opinion about expelling people from Council?

NE: It's there as a last resort. I hope I would never have to do it, but clearly there are circumstances in which it might have to be done.

DR: I agree, but I am prepared to expel if necessary.

PA: It's a last resort, but at one council people were being intimidated, and people were giving a warning, and then people should be asked to leave.

Result:

Paul Afshar (St. John's): 44 votes.

Nicky Ellis (Queen's): 28 votes.

Daniel Roe (Balliol): 12 votes.

RON: 2 votes.

Election for Joint Consultative Committee

Present was Laura McInerney (St. Peter's). The candidate is henceforth referred to as 'LM'.

LM: This is one of those committees where vacancies knock around. It is a committee where the University and OUSU get together and make sure that OUSU is doing its job properly. As JCR president of St. Peter's I have experience of this. I want to do the job.

There were no questions for the candidate.

Result:

Laura McInerney (St. Peter's): 80 votes.

RON: 6 votes.

e. Reports from Sabbatical Officers

Vice President (Welfare) - Andrew Copson (Balliol College).

There's not much to add. Diversity week is almost over, it has been a real success and well done to all the co-chairs and everyone else who supported it.

Peter Morton (Somerville): I would like to congratulate the VP (Welfare) for Diversity Week and Somerville's condoms.

Helen McCabe: How many people do you think attended our events?

[Now referred to as 'HM (St. Hilda's)']

AC (Balliol): Over a thousand by the end of the week, and it was all different people. A diversity of people, you might say.

P. Duncan Weldon (Somerville): Can you confirm that Somerville used three times as many condoms as the nearest college.

AC (Balliol): They are obviously more safety conscious.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): What do you think made it more successful than last year?

AC (Balliol): Last year was our first time. We had more money last time, so we could spend more without it costing OUSU. There's still a problem with advertising, it didn't get through to every student. Should be even more successful next year.

Chris Hanretty (St. Anne's): What's all this about the committee for diversity and equality being cancelled?

AC (Balliol): I'm building up to an angry fight, because the University refuses to tell us what is in the report they have they received. I have asked the Head of Council Secretariat what is going on, and she was extremely rude and said we couldn't see it. We don't know what we are going to do yet, but we will definitely do something.

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): I am concerned about things from Hilda's and disabilities

action in the report, can you write and express our concern?

AC (Balliol): It is the worst possible time for the University to dissolve its equal opportunities section. Mel Marshall I will go and see them, and say we are very worried now it has been raised in Council. We will ask and try to take it higher.

President - Will Straw (New College):

WS (New): Take the shirt off my back campaign: please do all take a flier. Find an old shirt and send it to OUSU. We want to take clothes racks to Downing Street. It'll be good. The NUS are organising a mass lobby of parliament. Anyone can go, as long as you have a meeting booked with your MP. Big march on March 8th for free education. Tony Benn may come. And David Rendel (Lib Dem, HE spokesman). Last week's motion on Pakistan has been well written up in the Pakistani press, and we may be able to remove him from his office. Press have been interested in Chancellor statement, and one candidate has said they will sign it, and if they get the nominations we can nominate them in 7th week council. Elections are on 27th Feb (Thursday of 6th week). 2 co-chair vacancies for international students. Apply!

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): Were you aware that the naked shirts protest was nominated for the best student protest? Were you sorry not to be there?

WS (New): Yes. Computer problems etc. meant I couldn't be there. It's an imaginative campaign, and I'm glad that the Finance and Funding Campaign is now behind it.

Phil Thompson (St. John's): Please explain the reference to 'unpleasantness' in your report.

WS (New): There hasn't been any.

Phil Thompson (St. John's): Well, what was it?

WS (New): There hasn't been any.

Chris Hanretty (St. Anne's): What difference has there been in the last two weeks?

WS (New): I haven't been featured unpleasantly in the Cherwell or OxStu. No unpleasant or inaccurate emails. No one accosting me in the street, no nasty questions in Council. Pleasant fortnight.

Paul Ashfar (St. John's): Did you like the Ode to Will?

WS (New): Very funny.

Penny Berrill: How many Diversity Week events have you attended? Do you support Diversity Week?

WS (New): Yes, of course I support Diversity Week. I went to the International Cultural Event. I'm sorry I couldn't attend more.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): Could you define the difference between unpleasantness and being held to account?

WS (New): Sometimes people have used personal grievances to get at me.

John Blake (St. Hugh's): Who is the candidate prepared to sign the statement?

[Now referred to as 'JB (St. Hugh's)']

WS (New): Sandi Toksvig.

Ryan McGee (Pembroke): What do you think about the timing of the College Inequality report next term? Will you be attending the next college inequality meeting on Tuesday at 3pm?

WS (New): This is one of the best things that OUSU will achieve this year. Looking forward to it. Already anticipate a lot of interest from the press.

Vice President (Finance) - Sean Sullivan (St. Edmund's Hall).

Sean Sullivan (St. Edmund's Hall): I have nothing to add.

[Now referred to as 'SS (SEH)']

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): I have asked about the disabilities guide many times. It has now been produced Thank you Sean.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): I mentioned the amended budget. Are there copies?

Ros Dampier receives one amended budget.

Vice President (Women) - Mel Marshall (Christ Church).

Melanie Marshall (Christ Church): Not the most pleasant fortnight ever, but it is all going to be worth it. Come to the Cabaret at 7:30 in Teddy Hall. It'll be great. Entry is free. There's also a collection for Oxford Sexual Abuse and Rape Crises centre. If anyone is coming to NUS Women's Conference will they please email me to decide on train times.

[Now referred to as 'MM (ChCh)']

Ryan McGee (Pembroke): Mel, will you be performing?

MM (ChCh): Yes I will.

Chair: What?

MM (ChCh): It's a surprise.

Vice President (Graduates) - Andy Garlick (Christ Church).

AG (ChCh): Mature student event as Diversity Week had a good turnout of about 70. Mature Students Committee is alive and thriving. Post Graduate assembly is moving to Christ Church. Dealing with the threat of continuation fees at the moment. Been to Oxford Pride, glad for any donations (Pride is on May 3rd). Contact me or AC (Balliol).

Nick Anstead (Mansfield): Where is the VP(Graduates) manifesto going to be published?

SS (SEH): There is no opportunity for it to be published in the Oxford Student. We can apply the electoral regulations. It's a complete farce.

Lyndsay Lomax (Keble): Someone handed in an invalid nomination, so I have reopened nominations. However, I didn't take into account the fact that the manifesto wouldn't be published. It went to Tribunal, but it was thrown out as too late.

[Now referred to as 'LL (Keble)']

Vice President (Academic Affairs and Access) - Sonia Sodha (St. Hilda's).

SoS (St. Hilda's): Two things to add. Firstly, representation on Senior Tutors' Committee. I'll be there next term (it only meets once) and successors will be able to do that as well. Library Opening Hours: I asked what was going on with the letter I wrote, and it has now become an item on the agenda for the Bodleian sub-committee. I have recommended asking the Union about shifting its opening hours from morning to afternoon. I have recognised that there will be a movement of technical staff which will require a change in all staff contracts which may make a change much easier.

JB (St. Hugh's): Would the VP (AccAff) like to tell Council about writing workshops?

SoS (Hilda's): Yes I would. They are run by students who are recommended by tutors as being good writers. More info in my report. They take place at Exeter college.

f. Reports from any members of the Executive who wish to make reports

Nick Anstead (Mansfield): Can I have an assurance that the manifesto for the Vice President (Graduates) will be at the ballot box?

LL (Keble): You can.

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): I am a bit concerned about how manifestos were in the Oxford Student. Declarations were printed quite a long way after the manifestos. There was no key to indicate what the political societies were. There was no information about expulsions or censures. Not much information about RON. Is this in line with the Education Act?

SS (SEH): Do you mind if I answer that?

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): Yes.

LL (Keble): I'd prefer Sean to answer it.

SS (SEH): As VP (Finance) I am responsible for the publishing of the manifesto. We went over budget last year. We could not publish a joint manifesto booklet. So I did the next best thing. People will be directed to declarations at ballot box. This doesn't infringe the Education Act.

Peter Morton (Somerville): Whilst manifestos were on pages 6 and 7, the declarations were on page 16. No page reference or anything.

SS (SEH): The Oxford Student did not allow us to do so.

Peter Morton (Somerville): Was it not possible to make a reference on page 6 or 7??

SS (SEH): You were referred to pages 6 and 7 on page 16.

AG (ChCh): How many graduate colleges will have ballot boxes?

LL (Keble): Unsure. There are always postal votes, and ballot boxes will be in other colleges.

Chris Hanretty (St. Anne's): Can we put the manifestos on the website?

LL (Keble): Yes we can.

SS (SEH): No we can't.

Ali Richardson (St. Edmund's Hall): Can we postpone this election?

LL (Keble): No.

Ali Richardson (St. Edmund's Hall): This is a serious cock up, and it is not in line with the election regulations.

WS (New): You should make such complaints to RO, or to the elections tribunal.

Nicky Ellis (Queen's): Why can't you put them on the website?

SS (SEH): It's because the files are too large to be uploaded.

Tom Hart (Univ): Can we not just put a plain text version up there?

SS (SEH): No, because they are handed in as Quark documents.

P. Duncan Weldon (Somerville): We had a problem with Quark last year. Could you not ask for both?

WS (New): We have to change the Standing Orders. But we can't change the Standing Orders in time for 6th week. We need to review them.

Oscar Van Nooijen (Queen's): So does anyone have their manifesto on the website?

WS (New): Mine is up there, but it is very small.

SS (SEH): No.

WS (New): We can look at it.

MR (St. Peter's) NUS, Thursday of 6th week. Forms in soon please.

Linsey Cole (St. John's): Please fill in your target schools forms and send them back. [Now referred to as 'LC (SJC)']

JB (St. Hugh's): There is a JCC forum at Thursday at 1pm, Old Seminar Room Wadham. Come along. Please stand for International Students co chair.

NC (Univ): I am the Graduate Exec. Officer. An important part of my portfolio is graduate involvement. Please email me if you have any ideas.

j. First Reading of Changes to the Consitution.

j.I. Student Council.

In proposition:

WS (New) - Student Council is much clearer than anything else. Not everyone knows they are a member of OUSU.

Debate:

Chris Hanretty (St. Anne's): Members of Oriel JCR are students but not members of OUSU. They don't have the same rights. Therefore Student Council is misleading.

WS (New): Oriel members can still come but can't vote, so it's not misleading.

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): This motion is unnecessary. Better to change the product not the name, c.f. the Post Office and the trains.

AC (Balliol): It's a 'window-trimming' motion.

On a point of Order: Call for a move to a vote.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): No, I would like to make some points.

MTV passes

Summation Speeches:

For: WS (New): Vote for the motion.

Against: Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): This is a silly motion. There are lots of reasons why people don't come to council. At the meeting people didn't say that. Changing the name doesn't make any difference.

Motion passes.

Call for a recount.

Motion to recount passes.

Recounted votes:

49 for

22 against

6 abstentions

Motion passes.

j.2. Council Delegates.

In proposition:

Ed Watkins (Keble) - I made most of the points in the motion. I think we want delegates if they are more accountable, and they are not at the moment. There are small turnouts, and the discrepancies between turnouts are huge. Not a fair way of representing students. No college had more than 50% of people voting for delegates. It is also impossible to make delegates accountable, there is no body to hold them accountable. We have to decide if they should exist or not. Although not many people run, the same case is true of OUSU reps etc. But for OUSU reps it is possible to RON these people, and they are accountable to their JCR. This is not an attempt to give more power to JCRs. Need to find best method of electing people to this body. Best way is through JCRs. Delegates are an anachronism. They will go.

Short Factual Questions

Daniel Rees (Merton): How many people vote for exec officers?

Ed Watkins (Keble): About 100 more people.

MM (ChCh): As regards Council notes 3, and your comment of "lots more people turn out to JCR elections", can you tell me what JCRs, how long and when their elections are held?

Ed Watkins (Keble): I can't give a long time comparison, but I am sure they are right.

Joe Taylor (St. Hughs): If this motion passes will it abolish those currently holding the position or will they not be re-elected?

Ed Watkins (Keble): Not re-elected.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): Have you spoken to St. Hilda's about this?

Ed Watkins (Keble): No I haven't.

Bridget Phillipson (Hertford): Are delegates responsible for low turnouts in OUSU elections?

Ed Watkins (Keble): No, they're not.

Ali Richardson (St. Edmund's Hall): What was the original purpose of delegates?

Ed Watkins (Keble): To represent.... Oh, I'm wrong.

(Unrecorded person): Is it not true that the colleges you examine, is it not true that the stats you present will not be representative?

Ed Watkins (Keble): No.

Nicky Ellis (Queen's): Did Queen's have a typical turnout?

Ed Watkins (Keble): No, it didn't.

Peter Morton (Somerville): My college has 3 JCR votes and it has 2 MCR votes. If there are 30 colleges then would that be... 90 JCR votes, plus 60 MCR votes giving 150, then add the co-chairs, plus 6 or 7 sabs and 10 Executive officers. And 12 delegates. Are 12 delegates really 10% of all the votes?

Ed Watkins (Keble): No.

Oscar Van Nooijen (Queen's): When did you first consider putting forward this motion?

Ed Watkins (Keble): I thought about putting it to the last Council but I missed the deadline.

Call for a move to debate.

Move to debate passes

Speech in Opposition

MM (ChCh): When this brew-ha-ha blew up, I found out exactly what votes, 16% of votes are cross-campus, so we are talking about 7% of votes being from delegates.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): Looking at first preferences is not all that useful. However, people are elected with over 400 first preferences, and two years ago someone lost with over 100 votes. This year Ellie Dewhurst received over 300 votes. This is different to JCRs. St. Hilda's JCR president was elected with less than 150 votes, no Teddy Hall JCR president in the ...

Eleanor Thompson (Wadham): Vested interest elected delegate in 1st year. 1) Delegates useful as a cross-campus top-up; voice of those not represented by JCRs;

2) 12 people who are not there for JCRs or from OUSU. Provide a pool of people who can become co-chairs, critics, sabbaticals etc.

Oscar Van Nooijen (Queen's): This is a bad motion. I urge you to vote against it if you don't already have a mandate. I promised during the election period that I would support delegates, as did my opponent, and between us we polled over 3000 votes, demonstrating that there's a substantial number of students in favour of that policy position.

Point of Information: AC (Balliol) - In fact, both candidates said they would reintroduce delegates.

Oscar Van Nooijen (Queen's): AC is quite right - so even if this motion passes you can be sure that the President-elect will bring forward a motion early next year to reverse it.

Ed Watkins (Keble): 8% does not take away from the fact that they don't have as strong mandates as other representatives. Also, we should not have a set of votes in Council to encourage other people to come along.

James Duffy (Christ Church): I concur with Ed. It doesn't matter if it's just 12 people. In Christ Church there is a belief that delegates hold a lot of sway. These 12 people aren't elected by the majority of people. Only responsible to themselves. No one checks what they said in their manifesto

Dominic Curran (St. Hugh's): Election as OUSU Rep concentrated on competence as committee member, not political prowess. Delegates provide somewhat flawed but acceptable way of providing a political voice.

Ryan McGee (Pembroke): Delegates perform a role that is not acceptable in Council. Council is illegitimate because the 12 people vote against them on motions and it turns off JCR representatives. I am held accountable to my electorate, The 12 delegates are not accountable. 12 people can overrule 4 JCRs. Vote for the second motion and reform these illegitimate delegates. I have never said anything anti-delegate; have never said I want to abolish them.

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): 3 motions in one month just on delegates! OUSU as a Student Union is not simply a confederation of colleges. There is a question over whether delegates are best for cross-campus representation. You can't force people to vote as delegates. This motion is a drastic measure when we haven't even tried to reform anything.

Matt Sellwood (New): I'm a former delegate and fierce critic of OUSU. I don't think that it's fair to rule out the political views of your entire union / university. Some political views cannot be represented in JCRs e.g. environment committee, ethics committee. Student Unions need to talk about these issue. Delegates are a good way to achieve that.

Jocelyn Paulley (Jesus): Jesus is a small college. 150 votes for JCR President is a substantial proportion so be careful about statistics.

Helena Puig Larrauri (St. Hilda's): We shouldn't abolish delegates just because we're no longer centrally affiliated. Also, there's no reason to think that delegates can't represent views. Accountability is a different thing and the second motion deals with that.

SS (SEH): 150 people in a college is a much higher proportion than 150 across the University. Delegates are not accountable. They made be good but they are not accountable. Executive is independent or party political. Abolition of delegates will not mean that it is only JCR Representatives. Minority views represented by Campaigns. The low turnout is not good enough. Delegates are not accountable.

Joe Taylor (St. Hugh's): Delegates increase the representation of Council. As a scientist I wouldn't be able to stand for another position so I can stand as a delegate to get involved.

Ryan McGee (Pembroke): Move to a vote. Same arguments in the next motion.

HM (St. Hilda's): There are more people on the list that would like to speak.

For 56,

Against 5,

Abs 4

MTV passes.

On a point of Order: Call for a Procedural Motion: Recorded vote.

In proposition: LR (Univ) - Many people have mandates on this issue.

SS (SEH): People can always go back and say how they voted.

For: 25,

Against: 31,

Abstentions: 18

Procedural Motion Passes.

Summation Speeches

For: Ed Watkins (Keble): The figures conclude that delegates cannot be reformed. Delegates cannot be made accountable. Delegates don't represent people in the University very well.

Against: JB (St. Hugh's) I fail to see the 12 black hooded figures looking around Council. Statistics aren't particularly helpful here. Delegates do represent people who share political views with them. Low turnout is sad, but an abolition would not help make Council any more representative.

For: 13

Against: 65

Abstentions: 9

Motion fails.

j.3. Council Delegates 2.

In proposition:

WS (New) - Obviously, from the last motion we have seen that people do wish to retain delegates. There are two themes to people's problems. 1) They are not

accountable, and 2) they lack legitimacy. I wrote my motion separately to Ed Watkins; not as a response. This is something that people have been talking about all year. It has been discussed in Sab, meetings, Exec, PresCom and OUSU Reps meetings. It's straightforward: who are the delegates accountable to? Their manifestoes primarily - they do nothing but turn up to Council and vote. So why not record all of their votes and people who are interested can see if they kept to their manifestos. I put in the thing about secret ballot because it is interesting, because I don't think they should be able to hide behind their vote but I don't feel strongly on this. The second thing is making sure they are legitimate. This year delegates have been turning up, but in the past that has not been the case. I will table a motion of no-confidence against those who do not turn up to Council. The Exec is the best place to decide if it a legitimate excuse.

Chair: I am unable to take any amendments tabled after midday Wednesday for constitutional reasons.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): On a point of Order. Procedural Motion - can we table the main motion? I didn't realise that we couldn't amend it, but I think people should be allowed to do so. People should be able to make amendments.

WS (New): On a point of information. It can't be tabled to next Council, as first readings cannot take place at 7th Week Council. This needs to be done now.

Nicky Ellis (Queen's): On a point of Order. Procedural Motion. Move that we suspend part of the standing orders to hear amendments.

Chair :Yes, ok. It's the first time I've used this and its exciting.

Nicky Ellis (Queen's): I think that there are circumstances in which it would be important that people should not be messing around with a constitutional motion, but here Will has said that there were things he was not sure of. I don't think people would object to this.

SS (SEH): The reason we have that part of the Constitution is that amending the Constitution is so important, and I would be very reticent to waive those standing orders. We're not meant to do that.

Chair: This requires a 2/3rds majority to pass.

For: 42,

Against: 24,

Abstentions: 7

Procedural Motion Fails.

Chair: Right, back to Ros's original procedural motion.

Ros: Can I have another speech in favour? I want it tabled to 1st Week Trinity

Procedural Motion passes.

This motion is thus tabled for Wk. 1. Council, Trinity Term.

j.4. Council Review.

Chair: I now have a motion proposed by me. We need a new chair. And we've just elected one.

Paul Afshar (St. John's) takes the Chair.

['Chair' now refers to Paul Afshar rather than Conor.]

Conor O'Neill (Wadham): I said I would conduct a review of Council's procedures. The report is at the back, I don't think it is very controversial. I wanted to gain the consensus of as many people's views as possible. I had several meetings with various people to get a representative sample. Because I was aiming for consensus, the ones I have offered are not radical. It comes down to this: the main problem with Council is that it goes on a long time. It means things get tabled and rushed. Secondly, the Standing Orders are contradictory and require a wholesale review. I didn't have the required time to do this, though. It would be fantastic for someone to do it, because it is laid out oddly. I want to sort out the order of business, and say what the order of business is and give the Chair the right to control it, although people can overturn the ruling of Chair. Standard listing for administrative convenience. I want to add in questions for Executive member as it is not there currently, it should be in writing. There should be speaking limits. I did this off my own back: I used a woolly clause to do it, but I'd like it confirmed in writing. Should there be guillotines? It's not ideal. Instead your first speech in prop and opp are five minutes, others are two, but people can have more if they want. This works because we have situations where we get lists of people who want to speak but they never get finished. If someone really wants to talk they can, and there are safety clauses in there. That is basically it.

Ali Richardson (St. Edmund's Hall): On a point of Order - I move that this be tabled. There are parts of this motion that need to be amended. I'm unhappy with the order of business being at the discretion of the Chair.

Conor O'Neill (Wadham): I'm unhappy with it being tabled, and the provision objected to is the Standing orders.

Chair: This requires a 2/3rds majority to pass.

For: I vote

Procedural Motion Fails.

Short Factual Questions:

Eleanor Thompson (Wadham): Are you aware that your speech in proposition was over 5 mins? Do you think that is good?

Conor O'Neill (Wadham): Yes. I do.

MM (ChCh): When you say a show of hands is that not mildly dodgy?

Conor O'Neill (Wadham): The show of hands rule is in the Constitution and I take it to mean a majority.

Motion Passes.

Paul Afshar (St. John's) remains in the Chair.

k. The Budget or Amended Budget.

SS (SEH): Each Hilary term for 5th Week Council the VP (Finance) must bring an amended budget. We start a new budget in summer that is written in advance by our predecessor, which binds them. What I am amending with this budget is that set by my predecessor. We have to make the predictions of the earlier budget and make them a little more realistic. The first one can be spot on or wildly out, and we also now have certain figures. You can now see the comparisons on the sheet. Divided into four grants from university, OUSU money, headings that produce money, headings that produce loss. We've been able to give exact figures for some, other times I have simply changed predictions for headings. General overview: Our audited accounts showed a far larger loss than the previous VP (Finance) predicted.

Conor O'Neill (Wadham) retakes the chair.
['Chair' therefore refers to Conor O'Neill again]

SS (SEH): It was a very unrealistic budget. There is no £10,000 profit, but a £31,000 loss. It is difficult because our ad income is down for all sorts of reasons, which affect many things. It has gone down significantly. We also find expenditure very difficult to cut, because any substantial cuts would have to be made on salaries and the offices. We have made the OxStu cheaper, but we are going to make a loss and have to bear it. We will have to instigate changes to try and break even next year. It is confusing. We also have to pass the audited accounts for last year, this is the confirmed figures for how OUSU existed financially 2001/02. There was a £52,000 loss. It is not something that will bankrupt us, but it needs to be looked at. We also need to pass the letter being displayed on the OHP to our auditors, representations we have to make legally.

Chair: Regarding the letter: Any short factual questions? Any objections?
No objections. **Letter passes.**

Chair: Regarding the accounts for the year past. Any short factual questions? Any objections?
No objections. **Accounts Passed.**

Chair: Regarding the amended budget. Any short factual questions?

Laura Santana (St. Hilda's): How come F&F gets so much and One World so little?
SS (SEH): It is about expenditure. One World simply do not spend that much, F&F do.

Rosie Buckland (St. Hilda's): Expand on why we don't need seven Sabbaticals.
SS (SEH): This is my introduction, looking at the stark situation in which we have 7 sabs, with 7 salaries. We have cut our non-sab staff costs, and couldn't cut them any more. I am flagging up where further cuts might potentially be made.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): As Women's Campaign chair we have already gone over our budget so surely we should have an increased budget?
SS (SEH): That is simply not true. Their calendar ate up so much of their budget. I've

increased the budget to make people happy. I spoke to Ex-Co-Chair.

Dominic Curran (St. Hugh's): Do you anticipate the move to new premises having a significant impact upon running expenses?

SS (SEH): Hopefully not once we move; hopefully the shop will make a profit. It will cost us £60,000 of our reserves, but that is what it is there for. We will be financially secure, and we will be in a better position.

Oliver Moreton (New): Regarding making cuts to the budget: how much would the deficit have been without the cuts? What provisions are there in general?

Chair: On a point of order: Move to Debate

SS (SEH): Let's carry on. I kept Council informed of these issues when the audited results returned and when the OxStu lost money. It is coming now because that is what the constitution says. As for cuts, this isn't really a cutting budget. It is just us trying to cope with the financial year in which we find ourselves in. We can't give commitments and then renege on them. I don't think our expenditure is likely to decrease. Was there any more? I have saved money in printing costs and I have made sure we have got the cheapest printing costs for every publication. I have decreased budgets where they are not using the money.

Oliver Moreton (New): The treasurer is powerless to make cuts until Trinity?

SS (SEH): The VP(Finance) can simply stop expenditure. If we were going into a bad stage, we have power to dismiss staff or sell. But these are core services.

Phil Thompson (St. John's): Explain the extra £2000 pounds for elections?

SS (SEH): Because the previous budget was unrealistic. Also I have to take into consideration that we have a by-election. We also had to have a 20 page J.M.B. which cost thousands of pounds over budget.

Tom Hart (University): The major discrepancy is in net income between what was expected and what we've got. The one that seems the biggest discrepancy is the Career Handbook. Why? Presumably in previous years these estimates have been right?

SS (SEH): To be fair ad revenue does fluctuate. But she got it very badly wrong. I don't understand how.

Budget Passes.

m. Other Motions.

m.l. Returning Officers Report Statutory Elections Michaelmas 2002.

Chair: On a point of Order - Nick is not a member of OUSU so with your permission I'd like to suspend the standing orders to allow it. Any objections? No. Also speaking rights for Nick? Good.

Nick Bennett (ex-RO) gains speaking rights.

In proposition:

Nick Bennett (Lincoln) - There were changes before the elections last year. There were three points where they came unstuck and they are in the report. There was a query from Christ Church where the ballot box was invalidated, and I received submissions from Christ Church representatives to both me and the Proctor. The request to ring them was reasonable. I don't think it should be in the rules, but we should have the final say as to whether a certain ballot box is valid or not. It is obviously extremely annoying if the ballot box is invalidated, but I wouldn't recommend any change.

Short Factual Questions:

Phil Thompson (St. John's): Why is your report a tenth of the length of the former RO reports?

Nick Bennett (Lincoln): Reports have been blow-by-blow and I don't see the point. It is information for you about the problems, and we really have just those three problems. I'm not writing a thirty page diatribe about certain people.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): I'll leave what I have to say to debate.

Michael Girling (St. Edmund's Hall): I read the Oxford Student and I had read a front page about shit in this election. Why is it not mentioned?

Nick Bennett (Lincoln): All that needs to be said was said in the press. This is a purely factual report.

Andrew Warner (Christ Church): Given that there is a motion about an electoral review will you pass our letter on to them?

Nick Bennett (Lincoln): Yes I will.

Dominic Curran (St. Hugh's): Were you happy that the Oxford Student article was accurate?

Nick Bennett (Lincoln): I had no problem with it.

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): Report should hang around as a reference document for people wanting to look through them. In three years time people will need a longer report than this.

Nick Bennett (Lincoln): Well, that is the report I have submitted. It seemed sensible that this should be the way it is done.

Michael Girling (St. Edmund's Hall): What is different between what is available next week and this?

Nick Bennett (Lincoln): That would be the college breakdown.

Phil Thompson (St. John's): Can we have this put on the website?

Nick Bennett (Lincoln): Yes.

Omar Salem (St. Hugh's): Should there not be questions asked about people knowing how to count STV?

Nick Bennett (Lincoln): No, it wasn't a problem.

Call for a move to debate. No opposition.

Debate:

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): I'm sorry to do this but I think there are concerns about this report to accept it. It looks as though it took to RO about ten minutes to write and lacks a deeper discussion. I would like a full breakdown, all the rules broken, etc. Accountability for someone paid as much as RO is poor - I thought this was a summary. This was the first year a new set of regulations was used - there should be a detailed report of that which would be useful if we intend to assess the regulations. There were numerous problems that I noticed as an activist: there is simply too much missing. There are also several factual inaccuracies. I think this is wholly inadequate.

SS (SEH): We should note that this is entitled 'the RO's report'. This is his report and he has made it. How can we demand he write something else? This is his report of what he feels is relevant. The suggestion is that it should be a little more like previous reports. I never want to see those again; they were awful, bitchy and long. The points to RO believes are significant are the ones we should accept. As to info that should have been attached, it is available to anyone, including next year's RO.

Anthony Hawkins (St. Edmund's Hall): Does Council have an extra report? Or otherwise the RO can say anything.

Omar Salem (St. Hugh's): We shouldn't just vote this through. The reason we have a vote is because we can vote to accept it. There are major issues with it.

HM (St. Hilda's): This is the same as any other motion. We should be able to say no to this.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): I'm not trying to bring up the same points again, but this report is completely inadequate. I'm sure that bitchiness did not make up the majority of reports, and we need the information that can be used as precedent next year. We paid the RO and we should demand something more useful.

Phil Thompson (St. John's): Sean is wrong about the past report. Last year was the first year that the RO was paid, and that report was very useful in the recommendations that led to an electoral review. Little complaint about that report.

WS (New): The report last year led to the electoral review. We have a motion for that. This report is a bit of constitutional nonsense. I need to take this to JCC. The RO could send this again if we table this. Points about the election are for the electoral review.

SS (SEH): On a point of order: Move to a vote. We've heard both sides now.

Laura West (St. Catherine's): No, there are still points to be addressed.

[Now referred to as 'LW (Catz)']

For: 26,

Against: 18,

Abstentions: 2

Procedural Motion fails.

Phil Thompson (St. John's): I feel sorry for anyone chairing this electoral review if this is all they have to go on.

Call for a move to a vote.

For: 26,

Against: 23,

Abstentions: 2

Procedural Motion fails.

LW (Catz): For the President to say that this is constitutional nonsense is inappropriate. And I would ask the RO that, since we paid him, he goes away and addresses Council's concerns.

Nick Bennett (Lincoln): If you reject this then I will write another one.

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): Every single time there is a review going on there is not enough information. This is a fine summary, but we need far more.

Call for a move to a vote. **Procedural Motion passes.**

Summation Speeches:

For: Nick Bennett (Lincoln): If you want to reject this report then that is your right. But these are the problems I found. The rules are basically sound, but I will write another report if you want it. Though I honestly don't agree that a ten page report detailing the intricacies of the election would be that useful.

Against: LW (Catz): People obviously aren't happy with this. The RO has fulfilled his obligations as he sees them, but we are not happy and therefore we should get more information in this report.

For: 16,

Against: 28,

Abstentions: 11

Motion fails.

m.2: Electoral Review.

Nick Anstead (Mansfield): Elections are contentious issues. Mammoth election review last year. People's experiences of what went right and wrong. People should be allowed to have their say again on how the new election regs worked. Hope it passes.

Short Factual Questions:

Greg Stafford (St. Peter's): Why is it chaired by the Vice President (Women)?

WS (New): She's the rules guru of OUSU.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): How might we get a better representation of views?

Nick Anstead (Mansfield): Ask more people. Get more involved.

James Duffy (Christ Church): Will you consider the letter from Christ Church, and the fact that the RO said it was unfair?

Nick Anstead (Mansfield): It's not up to me but submit it and see what happens.

No opposition. **Motion passes.**

m.4: The Licensing Act (2003)

In proposition: Anthony Hawkins (St. Edmund's Hall) - I would like to propose two amendments.

Amendment: To alter 'Council Resolves 1' as a friendly amendment.

Amend Council Resolves 1 to read 'Oppose those provisions of the Licensing Act 2003 that relate to the licensing of Public Entertainment'.

Amendment: To alter 'Council Resolves 3' as a friendly amendment.

Amend Council Resolves 3 to read 'To express our anger at those provisions of the Licensing Act 2003 that relate to the licensing of Public Entertainment.'

Amendments pass nem con.

Anthony Hawkins (St. Edmund's Hall): Government are trying to look at a new licensing act that will affect students (provision of regulated entertainment plays, performances etc.). People that wouldn't have previously needed a license will now need one. Up to £500. Colleges cannot afford to pay for this, and therefore we should oppose it

Short Factual Questions:

Jamie Johnson (Somerville): Would the licensing act only relate to things if alcohol is served on site?

Anthony Hawkins (St. Edmund's Hall): No, that's incorrect. There are two separate parts: one affecting alcohol, one not. Churches, rehearsals, plays even when no alcohol served are all affected.

Omar Salem (St. Hugh's): Does the licensing act deal with any other stuff as well?

Motion passes

n. Any other Business

AC (Balliol): Issue with Common Room alcohol served in bars and pricing of it. We

overturned the university's resolution to increase prices. If any presidents want to say something about this, contact me. Where would people drink if not the college bar?

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): Women's cabaret tonight. St Hilda's single sex college. lilac ribbons available from me, Helen and Penny.

Laura Santana (St. Hilda's): Stop the war petition now online. Encourage tutors to sign up. Cambridge are doing it and we want more. "<http://www.oxford-petition.com/>"

LW (Catz): Entz forum met twice, good turnout. Discuss any issues which entz people want. Balls people have open meeting - no agenda, just raise concerns. There's a bop on Saturday at St. Anthony's - clash of civilisations/international beats. Volunteering for stewards needed.

SoS (St. Hilda's): Thanks to Andrew for Diversity Week <applause>

WS (New): Help to tidy chairs please!

Penny Berrill (St. Hilda's): Disabilities guides for visits. Need co-chairs.

Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's): Thanks to Conor <applause and general thigh rubbing>
Queer rights need female co-chair.

Louise Radnofsky (Univ): A female co-chair for Queer Rights is required.

Election of bar: Kings Arms.

Minutes End.