



5th Week Hilary Term 2004
Friday 20th February at 2pm

a. minutes of the previous meeting

The discourse between Conor O'Neill and John Blake is not accurate. It should read:

John Blake (St Hughs):

Does this motion address the role of the incumbent Executive in the Annual Elections?

Conor O'Neill (Wadham):

It mandates a sabbatical officer to review the issue.

Lorna Stevenson and Sarah Maynard's names also need correcting.

c. ratifications in council

Charities Exec; no objections.

President: Dave Salcedo (Christ Church)
Treasurer: Adam Kyebird (Pembroke)
Secretary: Liz Jeremy (Keble)
Publicity Officer: Katie Prescott (Pembroke)
Reps' Chair: Lucy Phipps (St Hilda's)
Charity Liaison Officer: Hollie Robson-Marchant (University)

DROs; no objections.

Edward Burton (Christ Church)
Charlotte Jepps (Christ Church)

Elections Committee; no objections.

Chris Allan (Somerville)
Rodrigo Davies (Wadham)
Dan Paskins (Magdalen)
Ian Caddy (St Anne's)

d. elections in council

NB Chair of Council acted as Returning Officer

Elections Tribunal Reserve Panel

Adrian Viens (St Anne's)

Chair: Adrian Vines is not here but he has no declarations to make.

Elected.

Returning Officer; this election was conducted by the Chair of Council

Helena Puig Larrauri (St Hilda's)

Chair: There is no RON option for RO.

Elected.

Returning Officer; this election was conducted by the Chair of Council

Helena Puig Larrauri (St Hilda's)

Chair: There is no RON option for RO.

HPL: I can do the job well because I know the rules etc.

DP: What are the main things to do this term?

HPL: The referendum.

RD: What do you think to RO sitting on JT?

HPL: Can be useful and I would do this if I felt so but if it was a complaint against my conduct then I wouldn't.

e. Reports from Sabbatical Officers:

HPL: Mike Woodham tutor at Balliol has been diagnosed with cancer so please sign this card for him. If you have had a summons from the Proctor then do get in touch with me or Louise and we can talk them thru things. In report I talk about the AUT and I have now had a response from the university and they will reschedule lectures if the lecturers agree to do this and ditto for the university. Also, it is the VP (Finance)'s birthday tomorrow so I think we ought to celebrate this in the traditional manner.

All: Happy Birthday to you. Happy birthday to you. Happy birthday dear Digo. Happy birthday to you. *Applause.*

Chair: No clapping in council.

RD: Nothing to add except please read the amended budget and please ask me questions if you have any.

RB: It's been Diversity Week this week. I've just come back from a disabilities awareness training session. We had a Queer Rights event yesterday and there will be an event at Balliol tonight. I've also had a meeting about the college doctors so talk to me about that if you want to know anything. Equal opps is moving forward.

CW: Reclaim the Night march is this Thursday, please come along and please make up any decent chants you can. Meet at 8 on the steps of the Clarendon Building. Please come. Nightbus won't be running tomorrow night sorry.

DP: PGA will be next Monday in Magdalen at 7pm. Code of practice for college advisers is being re-written at the moment and is taking a lot of initiative from OUSU's student submission. If you want to see it then do get in touch.

LM: Thanks to all who helped with target schools mailing especially Charlyne and Dan. Secondly, study skills session was fantastic with 80 people coming. If you have any subject-specific requests then do get in touch. You'll all get letters in your pidge about schools visiting over Easter so do think about doing it. Also Rosie has done a fantastic job.

JHB: Tomorrow is the Alternative Careers and Volunteering Fair so please come along.

g. Questions to Members of the Executive

Lorna Stevenson (Hertford):

How do we find out who is on strike?

HPL: We don't know, ask the lecturers personally. The university hasn't been very cooperative and the AUT doesn't know.

Dominic Curran (St Hughs):

Has there been any progress in renewing the grants for sabbatical officers and other funding.

RD: We're not sure.

JHB: Will probably be a 50% continuation of what it is at the moment but we won't know until the end of March.

Ros Dampier (St Hilda's):

Has there been any progress in renewing the grants for sabbatical officers and other funding.

RD: We're not sure.

JHB: Will probably be a 50% continuation of what it is at the moment but we won't know until the end of March.

Ros Dampier (St Hilda's):

Why wasn't St Hilda's pidge about Diversity Week?

RB: Only about 12 college lodges will let students pidge things.

Chris Guelff (Magdalen):

Could we have some system of validating OUSU officers so that they will be allowed to pidge.

JHB: We've been talking about this and it could work.

RD: We do send out instructions to Head Porters etc when we were pidgeing in bulk and although the head porter said there wasn't a problem the info wasn't disseminated.

Katherine Lim (SEH):

I did try to pidge St Hilda's but wasn't allowed to.

k. First readings of Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders

CO'N: I've assisted Dan in this and its consistent with the motion from 1st week MT03 and this should avoid difficulties of getting people to stand. It should increase democracy because it will put ballot boxes nearer students.

C3d2: this means that it won't be mandatory to put a graduate JMB in the OxStu.

C4c: this will allow us to put ballot boxes where the graduate students are in colleges and then also in a department for each divisional board.

C4e: this makes the rest of the standing orders in line with this.

Helen McCabe (St Hilda's):

How do people ensure that they don't duplicate?

CO'N: Grads are organised by faculty and we can cross-reference the lists to ensure this won't happen. Our voter lists will have taken out duplications.

LM: Will people have to have photo ID?

CO'N: CROs and therefore scrutineers have the right to request this.

Laura Stevenson (Hertford):

Do you have to vote in college if you're college has a box.

CO'N: Yes.

Passes.

CO'N: This comes from the series of very long councils of MT02. There is a lot of debate over what actually happened as said in Council Notes. This stems from the fact that we do occasionally have very long meetings of council and the chair of council has to ensure that debate is allowed but that we get all business finished. At the moment the chair of council can use his discretion. This will tidy up the ambiguity and will ensure greater democracy.

DP: I don't understand resolves 2.

CO'N: This text is in the SO and this is just to get rid of this.

Ros Dampier (St Hilda's):

of council has to ensure that debate is allowed but that we get all business finished. At the moment the chair of council can use his discretion . This will tidy up the ambiguity and will ensure greater democracy.

DP: I don't understand resolves 2.

CO'N: This text is in the SO and this is just to get rid of this.

Ros Dampier (St Hilda's):

Shouldn't we have the whole motion back?

CON: No

Tom Packer (St Cross):

Please explain.

CON: At the moment the chair of council can arbitrarily decide how long to limit things to and this will just ensure that there is no bias.

Ros Dampier (St Hilda's):

The chair ruled that it could be taken in parts in the original motion and he shouldn't have done this.

Chair: This is a useful opportunity for Council to have a debate on the principle of the issue and then we can take it from there.

Ros Dampier (St Hilda's):

This is a bit of a mess. An interpretation was made at the time and we ought to stick by this.

CON: There is a part of the standing orders which a lot of people are unhappy with and this is an opportunity to make sure that the item there is either affirmed or changed.

Debate:

JB: I think that this will adversely affect the processes of council and that when we do have long sessions of council it is usually for a good reason.

Ros Dampier (St Hilda's):

I went to all meetings of the Council Review because I'm a sad gimp like that. In reality this will just mean that people continuously put up their hands to speak again and again and thus it would extend the time of council.

RD: I think that this will encourage a more diverse range of speakers and you should vote for it.

CO'N: In response to the points that have been made the motion says that after two minutes you will get a warning and then be allowed another minute and then you can ask council for an extension. I think Digo's point is good and there is also the provision for the Chair to ask for a quick vote to waive this.

Move to vote. Passes.

CON: I think it is important that this issue is resolved. I'm glad we've debated the merits of the motion and I think it has come out that this is the way forward and it also means there will be consistency between councils and

Ros Dampier (St Hilda's):

I think this debate has shown how often we would need to appeal to the chair.

Passes.

3. Responsive to Change

Andrew Copson (Balliol):

This motion has arisen out of the work that Daniel Finlay and I have done as part of the future and finances review. This motion will move the job descriptions of Sabs into the Standing Orders which will make it easier to change them and therefore it would make OUSU more responsive to change in general. Our expenditure and constitution are key

Passes.

3. Responsive to Change

Andrew Copson (Balliol):

This motion has arisen out of the work that Daniel Finlay and I have done as part of the future and finances review. This motion will move the job descriptions of Sabs into the Standing Orders which will make it easier to change them and therefore it would make OUSU more responsive to change in general. Our expenditure and constitution are key points

Neil Cowling (BNC):

Where will the responsibilities of Sabs be laid out?

AC: They will be in the SO's

Helen McCabe (St Hilda's):

What is the point?

AC: It can be changed more easily in the Standing Orders.

Dominic Curran (St Hughs):

Does this mean that a Sab's job description can be changed whilst they are in office.

AC: I believe that this can happen at the moment.

HPL: Yes they can but in OUSU terms they have to agree to it.

CON: Andrew and Dan have done a great job in this but I think this needs discussing. I think if we move this into the SO's then it will make it more flexible but this is a very important change and I think it should go through in two separate terms because then a new set of people get to look at it.

AC: These issues are never going to be seen as unimportant and I think there will still be sufficient opportunity to debate changes on it.

HPL: In the Constitution we say what the make-up of the Student Union is and the SO's say how everything is done.

RD: We define ends in the constitution and means in the standing orders.

4. Staffing in OUSU

AC: This motion concentrates on non-elected staff who are generally administrative. There are four part-time members of staff in the general office and in the review we looked into the efficiency of these staff. This unit needs to be made as efficient as possible. The second bit of the motion deals with the procedures regarding staff and as part of this we want to add 'j' to the Standing Orders. This will be the forum for people complaining about staff and for changing the roles of staff, e.g. in the past when the post of Student Adviser was created it was all left down to the VP (WEO) and the Standing Committee would enable a better process for doing this. The third resolution is for F&F2 to consult with staff and executive about the Employees Handbook.

DC: To what extent is the motion the result of consultation with experts in employment law.

AC: They have all been approved.

RB: What is the current situation with regards to staff and how will this change things and is there currently an Employee's Handbook?

AC: There are a few sheets of scrappy paper but it is not up to scratch. There are no procedures in place at the moment.

Bridget Philips (Hertford):

Will this all be legally correct then and union acceptable?

AC: The GM offered to run it past a TU rep.

AC: There are a few sheets of scrappy paper but it is not up to scratch. There are no procedures in place at the moment.

Bridget Philips (Hertford):

Will this all be legally correct then and union acceptable?

AC: The GM offered to run it past a TU rep.

Tom Packer (St Cross):

Why is the GM on appointments committee?

AC: She is there because we thought that it would give an element of consistency to appointments because she is there over a longer period and will know more directly what is required than the elected officers.

LM: Are there any provisions for university representation on the Standing Committee?

AC: Yes.

Alan Strickland (Merton):

How much consultation has there been with the staff?

AC: There was one meeting with the general manager and the OUSU President and subsequent feedback has been incorporated into the motion.

RD (St Hildas):

Why these sabs on SC?

AC: Because they are effectively the line managers.

Amendments.

1.

RD: My amendment is to tidy up two things. I think that Notes 2 and Believes 2 are superfluous and could be construed as negative to staff.

AC: Notes 2 is essential to the motion at the moment. It is an expression of where concerns were made by people who we consulted with. Believes 2 is important if OUSU is to make the best use of resources. The intent was not to imply any form of criticism – the intent was

JB: I don't think this can be read as an implied criticism of anybody.

LM: I agree with John.

RD (St Hildas):

I think it is important to keep Notes 2 because there have been these concerns raised and the motion would not make sense without it there.

Move to vote.

Amendment fails.

2.

DP: It is important that our employees are covered by the legal structures that are in place in the UK. At the moment anyone can bring a motion to Council which will change the contracts and working conditions of our staff. I think it is much more sensible that this goes to the SC first and the Council will have a final veto over it.

JB: Why will it take a two thirds majority to over-rule decision of the Standing Committee?

DP: Similar to changing SO's, it's a big decision.

LM: What do you mean by working conditions?

DP: It is important that our employees are covered by the legal structures that are in place in the UK. At the moment anyone can bring a motion to Council which will change the contracts and working conditions of our staff. I think it is much more sensible that this goes to the SC first and the Council will have a final veto over it.

JB: Why will it take a two thirds majority to over-rule decision of the Standing Committee?

DP: Similar to changing SO's, it's a big decision.

LM: What do you mean by working conditions?

CON: It is the things not defined in the contract, e.g. meal breaks, provision of rest areas, things that are still very important in terms of staff morale.

RB: Has the original motion been found to be in contradiction of the law?

HPL: There is nothing directly illegal in this but the subsequent effects of it could be.

Tom Packer (St Cross):

Is there the possibility for this to be abused?

DP: Usual accountability procedures.

Lorna Stevenson (Hertford):

Will the Standing Committee have publically available minutes?

DP: You will be able to ask questions in Council to all members except the GM.

AC: What is the legal definition of "reasonably held belief"?

RD: Someone who can demonstrate using reasonable amounts of evidence that they have detailed knowledge, e.g. someone not working in the office could not have a "reasonably held belief" of the conditions.

LM: I can't find anything about who the employer is and doesn't a lot of this rest on the relationship between those

Lorna Stevenson (Hertford):

The law says you need this "reasonably held belief" and I think that with this amendment we are saying

JB: To make the assumption that council cannot become well informed is dangerous and this moves too much away from council's sovereignty.

CON: I think that this is about what Council is good at doing. However, there are better forums for this to happen and that is why it ought to be done in the SC.

HPL: I'm sure council could have a reasonably held belief but because this cannot be guaranteed and therefore it would be dangerous for council to hold these powers.

Dan Simpson (Balliol):

Because the Standing Committee are required to be informed they are a much better forum and it would be impossible for OUSU Council to legally or morally do this.

Edd Southerden:

I think that this could be giving too much power to the SC.

RD: "Reasonably held belief" has to be first hand knowledge and this isn't the case. At the moment Council can discuss these things but this will not take the sovereignty away.

Alan Strickland (Merton):

It is incredibly unprofessional and massively inefficient that council has the power to do this and the amendment is merely an example of the good practice which should prevail. Please vote for this amendment.

JB: I do genuinely think that this is handing far too much power to the Standing Committee and I don't think it is necessary.

discuss these things but this will not take the sovereignty away.

Alan Strickland (Merton):

It is incredibly unprofessional and massively inefficient that council has the power to do this and the amendment is merely an example of the good practice which should prevail. Please vote for this amendment.

JB: I do genuinely think that this is handing far too much power to the Standing Committee and I don't think it is necessary.

RD (St Hilda's):

I have concern about the SC making these decisions. Andrew has drawn up the SC to deal with other issues but not this one and they wouldn't be well placed to do it and maybe the Executive would be a better forum. I think this amendment hasn't been thought out enough and I can accept that maybe some changes are needed.

AC: Council has the power to do things but it can delegate things. I think that the motion as it stands is sufficient to meet our obligations. To give a body external to council all of these powers is bad for our control over our money and resources.

Move to vote.

DP: With my ratification as VP Grads I can assure you I didn't like having to sit here whilst you debated it and I've been coming here for years – but for other people to have their jobs debated in this forum is unsafe.

Tom Packer (St Cross):

This will affect a huge number of things and here we are transferring a significant amount of power away from here and one of the people on the SC will not even be a student member of OUSU and will not be accountable.

HPL: To the question of why the SC and not the Exec? Because it is a much smaller forum which the staff will be a lot more comfortable in. I think what will happen is that it will force us to consult more with our staff before things happen.

LM: We are currently a really crap employer and to be honest I'm not convinced by this amendment.

Dominic Curran (St Hugh's):

This provision may not point to simple working conditions such as tea breaks but say one year we needed to run another cross campus election then this would impact on the working conditions of the staff.

Ros Dampier, St Hilda's: There's ambiguity about what kind of thing "affects working conditions". We need to come back with a better motion to resolve this - vote this one down

Rosie Buckland, St Hilda's: I agree with Ros and I have concerns about the effect on the sovereignty of council. The motion was very well thought out, and the handbook's very good. The Student Advice Service hasn't been mentioned, and it will be affected by this ammendment. Council should be able to make decisions about the SAS. In terms of legality, even if council does suggest an illegal action it won't be carried out.

Connor O'Neill, Wadham: I propose we table the motion because it needs to be ammended further and can't be this term. Procedural motion to table it until 1st wk Trinity. We have a long, complex and generally good motion. Most parts of the ammendment are agreed upon. If the motion passes now we won't get the opportunity to change it.

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hilda's: We need to discuss this now to have something in place next term, whether or not the ammendment passes. We can fine tune the Standing Orders in a separate motion anyway if needed.

(Procedural motion is withdrawn)

Move To Vote: Proposition: We've debated this for long enough Opposition: There are some crucial things that haven't been said. For 27, Against 13, Abstain 1: Passes

Dan Paskins, Magdalen: I'm delighted that people agree with the principal of the ammendment. If council were to discuss an illegal motion then we're breaking the law - whether or not it was carried out. If a motion affects working conditions then we should be consulting the staff about it. This changes things for the better unless you think that council should be able to force changes on the staff without consulting them properly.

John Blake, St Hugh's: The wording of this is too ambiguous. We'd be giving away an enormous amount of power from council to a committee. The ammendment alters the entire nature of the standing committee, and it needs much wider consultation, followed by a new motion next term.

Dan Paskins, Magdalen: I'm delighted that people agree with the principal of the amendment. If council were to discuss an illegal motion then we're breaking the law - whether or not it was carried out. If a motion affects working conditions then we should be consulting the staff about it. This changes things for the better unless you think that council should be able to force changes on the staff without consulting them properly.

John Blake, St Hugh's: The wording of this is too ambiguous. We'd be giving away an enormous amount of power from council to a committee. The amendment alters the entire nature of the standing committee, and it needs much wider consultation, followed by a new motion next term.

Vote: For 26, Against 18, Abstain 3. Passes.

Andrew Copson and Daniel Finley no longer wish to propose the motion.

Helena Puig Larrauri (St Hilda's) and Rodrigo Davies (Wadham) are new proposers.

Discussion of amendment:

Council Resolves: To insert the following into the standing orders: Section K 4 (The filling of vacancies) - insert a paragraph 4.3 to state "No member of appointments committee shall be involved in the appointment of staff until they have received external equal opportunities training" Proposed: Chris Allan, Somerville Seconded: Ros Dampier, St Hilda's

Ros Dampier, St Hilda's: This is a very straightforward and sensible amendment. It's quite right that those involved in interviewing receive proper training. It shouldn't be controversial.

Tom Packer, St Cross: This could cause problems if there isn't enough time between someone joining appointments committee and them needing to take part in selection procedures. If some of the members have training and other don't then this could unbalance the committee. We should also be providing the training ourselves rather than insisting that it is done externally.

Connor O'Neill, Wadham: There will usually be lots of time to get training, and if there isn't it's better to delay the appointment than to have untrained people doing interviewing. We lobby the University to give tutors this kind of training, we need to do what we tell everyone else to do.

Move To Vote: Passes Ros Dampier, St Hilda's: I agree with Connor. We should be able to call ourselves an equal opportunities employer. Training needs to be from external people as clearly sabs can't train themselves.

Tom Packer, St Cross: We already provide training internally so shouldn't spend money on external training, especially when it means risking unbalancing the appointments committee.

Amendment passes.

Move To Vote: Fails.

Tom Packer, St Cross: The motion's changed massively now, so much so that the proposers have stopped supporting it. It's giving too much power to a standing committee. We need to go away and look at it freshly.

Rodrigo Davies, Wadham: I hope people will stop talking about the amendment just because they're annoyed it didn't go the way they wanted it to. If this fails we risk having no staff handbook, do we want that to happen? We've said we want to look after staff, provide better training for them etc, let's vote this through.

Daniel Finley (Balliol): It's changed so much as to become unrecognisable. Council will not longer have adequate control. Vote against the motion.

John Blake, St Hugh's: The amendment totally changed the standing committee and created a small body with absolute power. Just because people trust those who would be on it now doesn't necessarily mean it will be trustworthy in future years. This puts an enormous amount of power in the hands of a few people.

Andrew Copson, Balliol: To pass this now would be irresponsible. It's unfortunate that we'd lose the good parts of the motion, but that's the way it is.

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hilda's: I object to the claims that this amendment hasn't been properly thought out. We spoke to a lot of people as we were writing it. At the moment there is no accountability and no fixed systems for dealing with staffing issues. I don't want to work in an environment like that.

Quorum Count called. 42 voting members present (35 required)

Move To Vote: Passes.

Dan Paskins, Magdalen: This is a fantastic motion and has passed through all the correct procedures. We've had extensive debate and amendments. Whatever we think of the individual amendments we all know this makes OUSU a better employer. Support this motion, and we can discuss it again at termly council.

dealing with staffing issues. I don't want to work in an environment like that.

Quorum Count called. 42 voting members present (35 required)

Move To Vote: Passes.

Dan Paskins, Magdalen: This is a fantastic motion and has passed through all the correct procedures. We've had extensive debate and amendments. Whatever we think of the individual amendments we all know this makes OUSU a better employer. Support this motion, and we can discuss it again at termly council.

Andrew Copson, Balliol: The objections aren't due to bitterness at having lost the amendment vote, they're because of the content of the motion as it now stands. It puts far too much power into the hands of a small body.

For: 23 Against: 15 Abstain: 4

Motion passes.

Motion J: OSSL.

Daniel Finley, Balliol: These changes make OUSU's commercial activity better regulated. It provides limited liability, and the size & scale of our commercial operations means it's silly not to have limited liability. This sets up a formalised body to control publications to ensure they are in line with the interests of our members. It creates a more representative OSSL board, it's a positive change that's been well thought out.

No SFQs No Opposition Speech Motion passes

Amended budget: Rodrigo Davies, Wadham: Everything's explained in the budget but please ask any questions. I'm very happy with the budget. The surplus is better than expected, we've nearly made back last year's loss. Well done to the business manager.

SFQs: Tom Packer, St Cross: Does this affect affiliation fees? Rodrigo Davies, Wadham: No, but I'll be looking at those in the future.

Helen McCabe, St Hilda's: I was just wondering why it says 'new heading' next to the mature students row

Rodrigo Davies, Wadham: The original copies of the last budget didn't have that heading, I thought it might be useful.

Rodrigo Davies, Wadham: I want to amend the budget, at the time of writing we were expecting the Alternative Prospectus to make a large loss. Thanks to the VP AccAcAff the University has provided extra funds, so the loss will be much less.

No opposition to amendment.

Dominic Curran, St Hugh's: When the budget passed there were lots of concerns about how much money was available for the administration of OUSU. Have there been any problems?

Rodrigo Davies, Wadham: We've had to cut down expenditure on what you might call 'fixtures and fittings'. The staff have been very helpful with the adjustments. We're now spending the absolute bare minimum.

I'd like to add that the figures for the campaigns budgets are based on how much I expect them to spend, not how much I think they should receive.

Budget passes.

Discussion of question in referendum:

Chair: To clarify, you can add/remove/change the questions, but vote against this motion. Anyone want to amend the question?

Tom Packer, St Cross: Change decrease student numbers option to "Decrease student numbers at lower ranked universities" The whole idea behind the options selected is that they are being seriously proposed by someone. No-one is seriously suggesting reducing Oxbridge numbers, they suggest reducing numbers at polytechnics.

Point of Information: Polytechnics haven't existed for the last 10 years.

Greg Stafford, St Peter's: The option has been phrased to make it sound unattractive. Lots of people would want to vote for the amended option we shouldn't exclude it.

Ros Dampier, St Hilda's: I agree. Although I don't agree with the Tory policy, this new wording is much closer to what the Tory's suggest.

polytechnics.

Point of Information: Polytechnics haven't exists for the last 10 years.

Greg Stafford, St Peters: The option has been phrased to make it sound unattractive. Lots of people would want to vote for the ammended option we shouldn't exclude it.

Ros Dampier, St Hildas: I agree. Although I don't agree with the Tory policy, this new wording is much closer to what the Tory's suggest.

??? If we added this we'd also need to add options to reduce numbers at middle ranked unis, at higher ranked unis etc.

Rodrigo Davies, Wadham: This is a deliberately general option to stop things getting complicated. All options can be further subdivided to match specific suggestions. The rewording is to specific.

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hilda's: I think we could rephrase it as "decrease student numbers at some universities" it keeps it general but covers the Tory policy.

Tom Packer, St Cross: Can we vote on my suggestion first

Louise McMullan, Wadham: How do you 'rank' universities, there's no reliable way to do it.

Gareth Lyon, Keble: We wouldn't need to add options for cutting numbers at middle ranked unis etc, because no-one is suggesting them as policies

Vote: Ammendment fails.

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hilda's: I propose an ammendment so it reads "Decrease student numbers at some universities". It addresses Tom's concerns but avoids problems with ranking universities.

Bryn Adams, Christchurch: When the question was written the options were deliberately kept simple. This needlessly complicates it.

Lorna Stephenson, Hertford: How about changing it to "decrease student numbers on some courses"?

Chair: Let's discuss this first

Dan Paskins, Magdalen: The exact wording on the ballot paper isn't the point, as it's up to the campaigns to suggest specific ways of implementing the options. Some people do want to decrease numbers at Oxford. If a campaign group wants to target a reduction of numbers at certain unis/courses then they can.

MTV: Passes.

18 against, 10 for.

Ros Dampier, St Hilda's: Will these options have links to definitions of them?

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hilda's: There will be a glossary listing all terms.

Lorna Stephenson, Hertford: Propose to change it to "reduction of student numbers in certain areas"

Dan Simpson, Balliol: It's unnecessary, of course if we cut numbers then the cuts will happen in some areas

???? I object to the wording, has links to ideas like the north/south divide.

MTV: Passes

Lorna Stephenson, Hertford: People will know what we mean by this, and it's reflective of party policy

Louise McMullan, Wadham: People would interpret it in different ways, so they'd all be voting on different things.

Vote: Fails

Omar Salem, St Hugh's: The question doesn't make sense at the moment. Decreasing numbers by itself doesn't help solve the funding problem, you also need to increase per-head funding. The question shouldn't just ask about raising extra funds.

Dan Paskins, Magdalen: We can't have questions like "how should uni be funded" because all parties agree most of the cost should be met through taxation, it's the extra bit that we're debating.

MTV: Fails

Omar Salem, St Hugh's: The question doesn't make sense at the moment. Decreasing numbers by itself doesn't help solve the funding problem, you also need to increase per-head funding. The question shouldn't just ask about raising extra funds.

Dan Paskins, Magdalen: We can't have questions like "how should uni be funded" because all parties agree most of the cost should be met through taxation, it's the extra bit that we're debating.

MTV: Fails

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hilda's: I understand Omar's point, it's been discussed before. But no-one wants uni to be fully funded by fees.

Dominic Curran, St Hugh's: The original question doesn't cover all possibilities, particularly it doesn't really make sense to have "reduce student numbers" as a way to raise more money. We need to rephrase it to something like "How should the government close the funding gap?"

Amendment withdrawn

Gareth Lyon, Keble: Amend it to "Cut student numbers in those universities/courses with the highest drop-out rates". This is much closer to the wording and spirit of Tory policy.

Bryn Adams, Christchurch: We need to keep the wording simple, the glossary can explain the subtleties.

Tom Packer, St Cross: There's only 1 realistic option for decreasing numbers, so we may as well make it precise.

Vote: Amendment fails.

MTV: Passes.

Discussion of election regulations:

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hilda's: The regulations should cover everything, ask me questions.

Lorna Stephenson, Hertford: Can there only be one campaign for each option?

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hilda's: Not necessarily, it's up to the RO. There can be distinct campaigns for/against the same options.

Dominic Curran, St Hughs: The wording for the glossary of terms will be very sensitive. We've had a long debate about the phrasing of the question, which is less controversial. We shouldn't just leave it up to the RO to decide the wording. I realise we can't bring it to council, but is there anything else we could do?

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hilda's: It would be wrong for council to debate it because council isn't impartial. The elections committee is, and as with any decision by elections committee there are complaints procedures available.

Ros Dampier, St Hilda's: I propose we strike the clause about drawing lots for similar campaigns, as it goes against an existing standing order that says the resources/limits should be split between similar campaigns.

Rodrigo Davies, Wadham: If you strike this then what's the point in expenditure limits? You could get 200 of your mates to register fake campaigns to cut resources to the serious ones..

Ros Dampier, St Hilda's: That would break election regulations.

Helena Puig Larrauri: We can't overrule the SOs anyway.

Lorna Stephenson, Hertford: So we could take action against malicious/fake campaigns?

Helena Puig Larrauri, St Hilda's: Yes.

Quorum Count. 33 people present. 15 mins later 35 are present. Meeting continues.

MTV on amendment.

Amendment passes.

MTV on motion.

Motion passes.

MTV on ammendment.

Ammendment passes.

MTV on motion.

Motion passes.

Occupation Policy motion:

Dan Paskins, Magdalen: Move to table this motion until next meeting. It needs proper discussion, and we'll go inquorate before we can finish. There's no urgency about it.

No opposition, proc. motion passes.

AOB: Dan Simpson, Balliol: Come to the Disabilities Action event tonight at Balliol, there'll be fighting.

12

5th week Hilary 2004