

Dan Simpson: VP (Women) motion withdrawn.

Minutes

Will Drosey (Christchurch) : Please spell my name right

Iain Simpson (Magd.): Sorry

Ratifications in Council:

All appointments ratified nem con.

Policy passed by women's campaign: Objection

Policy passed by executive: Passed nem con.

WomCam Policy:

Claire Chalmers, Univ: This was passed by WomCam by unanimous vote. Over the last year in Oxford and across the country, there has been debate about sab women's positions. We'd like our union to commit to recognising the importance of WomCam as a unique authority on the way women's representation works in OUSU. WomCam is the natural place to go rather than Council. It is frustrating and exhausting for a campaign to have to fight unawares moves which will fundamentally change what they do. If we could have proper consultation it would make the process a lot less frustrating. WomCam would also like to see OUSU confirm the important of a women sab post, there's a big difference between maybe not being able to fund something and simply believing it shouldn't exist full stop. Please engage with WomCam on issues which affect WomCam in future, we're doing a lot of good work on finals gap and harassment, would be great to do it with the support of OUSU.

SFQ

Chris Allan: What does resolves 1 means?

Claire: Final discussion has to be made in Council, but that WomCam has to be consulted first. Trying to make sure that there's a proper discussion and consultation.

Chris Allan: Would a motion be ruled out of order if there wasn't enough consultation?

Dan Simpson: No. This would merely be policy saying it should.

Charlie Steel, Merton: What do you mean by consultation process?

Claire Chalmers: Ideally face to face contact in a proper meeting.

Helen Bagshaw, Balliol: What is the committee in resolves 2?

Claire Chalmers: We don't know, we were told there was a committee reviewing OUSU's future.

Emma Norris: No such committee exists and won't until the start of next term at the earliest.

Ellie Cumbo: But policy would come into effect when such a committee existed.

Debate

Helen Bagshaw: It's obvious what WomCam's position on the VP-Women is. Resolves 2 is irrelevant, the committee where decisions regarding OUSU's future is made is Council, and WomCam already have representation there.

Charlie Steel: This sets a very dangerous precedent, regarding other campaigns.

Ellie Cumbo: WomCam have not made any binding policy so far regarding the position of VP Women, but we think consultation should take place. Even if we don't like it then it can still go to Council. At the moment campaigns aren't in a position to engage with Council.

Chris Allan: I don't think setting a precedent that consultation should take place is a bad thing. We're merely saying we think stuff would work better if you consult with other people.

Hannah Stoddart: This motion doesn't bind Council, merely says consultation should take place.

Ed Maine: This is too vague to make any sense, I'm not entirely sure that I think WomCam should be able to hold Council to ransome.

?: Having consulted with WomCam makes it more likely to get a motion through, hardly holds anyone to ransome. Saves time having it happen there.

Mary Partington: This sort of rhetoric about holding Council to ransome is nonsense, surely people should be informed and be in a position to make decisions. We have the elected representatives of every JCR women's officer there in WomCam, this seems very practical. WomCam is set up as a semi-autonomous group. Council can vote against stuff if they want, but let it be clear they do so against WomCam's wishes.

MTV

MTV passes overwhelmingly.

Claire Chalmers: We do recognise that Council is the ultimate body of OUSU, asking for the opportunity to constructively engage with the future of womens representation in OUSU.

? : Resolves 2?

Dan Simpson: I interpret the word "the" as "any".

Helen Bagshaw: If you want to make sure that committees are fully consulted, then make a standing order change. It's obvious what the position of WomCam is when debating a motion.
Motion passes.

Ed Maine: Can we not have cheering during moves to vote.

Reports from Sabbatical Officers

Emma Norris: nothing to add to written report

Chris Allan: I'd like to invite you all to free champagne testing. Zoo is launching a new night tonight at Park End, I've got free tickets for everyone in Council. Just want to let everyone know if they're doing any sort of college magazine etc. get in touch with me and I'll see if I can help.

Aidan Randle-Conde: Please take away publications request forms, please fill them in and return them.

Ellie Cumbo: This week I have mostly been ill. Please come to the Vagina Monologues next year, profits to the Oxford abuse and rape crisis centre.

Oliver Russell: PGA will be meeting shortly, as will MCR Presidents dinner.

Helen Bagshaw: Sub fusc indicative poll will be taking place online.

Charlyne Pullen: Thanks to everyone who turned up to extraordinary Council, if anyone wants a copy of the policy please email me.

Hannah Stoddard: I'm talking to city about having more regular meetings between students and city council. Come to the RAG world food fair as well.

Kate Ferguson, Wadham: Pro-choice forum last night was very interesting, want to thank everyone who came.

Jennifer Small: Thanks to everyone who turned up to the SRI campaign.

Questions:

Frank Hardee, Oriol: Has there been a complete ruling out of the contract coming in Michaelmas?

Emma Norris: University say it won't go out, conference of colleges less certain, but based on my understanding I don't think it will.

Frank Hardee: What would you advise colleges to do?

Emma Norris: Get student charter inserted into college contract at college governing body.

Benny Spooner, Pembroke: Is reference to electronic voting in the standing orders?

Emma Norris: No, but there is precedent.

Matt Baker, Corpus: What was the sequence of events leading to non-discussion of SRI at university council?

Emma Norris: It got taken off the agenda, university claim it was miscommunication, I find that hard to believe.

Helen Bagshaw, Balliol: Has any decision been taken regarding VP-Grads?

Emma Norris: No.

Chris Allan: I'm working on an amended budget now which will come to seventh week council. Will put it out as soon as possible.

?, Merton: Is the electronic polling anonymous?

Oliver Russell: Only link is in the OUCS database, which is not accessible anywhere else.

No motions pass nem con.

Dan Simpson: No motions which amend standing order changes are needed.

Electoral Reform:

Benny Spooner: Procedural motion to take it in parts.

Dan Simpson: I rule that out of order. To take a motion in parts is to have the implication to amend it.

Benny

Iain: Had problems with last term's elections. The "Steele" clause caused problems. Ollie and I looked closer at the standing orders and want to remove an ambiguity. This tightens up procedure. This is good also for electronic voting. Requires approval of Returning Officer and OUSU Council.

Charlie: CIE3 about harassment. The word "suspect" can lead to a situation where someone is disciplined for taking no action.

Iain: Taken from University's policy on harassment. Arguably had problems last term. Effects on electoral staff can affect the election, as well as the individuals. Proctors'

Jenny Small (New): What does C15 mean?

Iain: Currently must make deposit. Gives possibility of fines. Sanction should be possible for a referendum campaign.

Ben Spooner (Pembroke): Do SOs say that ballot boxes have been in an election?

Iain: Rule of interpretation. Not for me to say.

Helen Bagshaw (Balliol): I have copy of SOs.

Charlie Steele (Merton): What about accusations of harassment?

Iain: Not too concerned about false accusations of harassment. People should be able to make a distinction between query and harassment.

MTD

Ben Spooner: I thought that electronic voting was not permitted. A clause should not be introduced that permits electronic voting. Have experience of electronic voting at Warwick- it leads to problems (eg system going down, staff members voting) Can't design electronic voting system that is perfect. Have comments from former RO saying that electronic voting does not work.

Charlie Steele (Merton) POI: Are we talking about Warwick?

?: This is Oxford, we're cleverer, so what if Warwick couldn't make it work.

Dan Simpson: Let's not be cocks.

Iain: POI: Can make these points in OUSU Council before a referendum

Ben: We can strike it out right now.

Chris Allan (Somerville): I disagree with the objection that we can't get a system that works. We had one a few years ago that worked. OUCS say that they're going to run it and it will work. Unreasonable to say that in all future elections electronic voting will fail.

MTV

Frank Hardee (Oriol): We all know how we're going to vote

Charlie: Need to clear up points before voting.

MTV passes

Iain: Two problems: Harassment issue. Taken from Proctors' and Assessor's Memorandum. Electronic voting issue. A lot of SUs use electronic voting. This will tighten rules rather way.

Charlie: CID2...

Chair: No new information

Charlie: RO should not decide if s/he is being harassed themselves. Proctors' and Assessor's Memorandum already covers harassment. See if electronic voting works for poll before referendum

Motion 2

P-T Exec reform

Alan Strickland (Merton): Motion by me and Emma Norris (Somerville). 7 full time officers, 14 part-time officers (10 general, 4 graduate). All elected in a single election. Cannot vote RON for a single candidate. Portfolios allocated after the election. We think this system is problematic. People discouraged from running- job title does not reflect role well. Does not allow a vote of RON for a single candidate for a specific responsibility. After the elections a private meeting is held in which portfolios are distributed. If you're really interested in a particular position why would you run, because you might not get it. There's be a clear list of duties in the standing orders so you'd know who was meant to be doing what, would increase accountability. What happens now is that people are elected and given portfolios in which they have absolutely no interest. The status quo is not a safe system.

SFQ

Ellie Cumbo: Why are we going from four graduate officers to three?

Alan Strickland: Oliver Russell said that was all that was required.

?: Have either the proposer or the seconder ever been on part-time exec?

Alan Strickland: No

Charlie Steel: Won't this mean that the exec pick co-chairs, and thus the next year's exec?

Alan Strickland: I think people run for exec with a variety of skills.

Daryl Leeworthy: Have you gauged interest from wider JCR membership, or have you just left it up to JCR Presidents and OUSU Reps?

Emma Norris: A proper consultation process which has taken almost a month has happened.

Kate Ferguson, Wadham: Where would my portfolio be in this new system?

Alan Strickland: I imagine it would come under environment and ethics.

Charlynn Pullen: Is this the system used by CUSU, and now they are now looking to change back to our system?

Alan Strickland: CUSU have more positions than we do.

Move to Debate

Chris Allan: This will totally change what the executive is and what it does. What this will create a situation in which everything is compartmentalised. This stops there being a central executive, it creates lots of reps, we already have those, they're called co-chairs. Executive should be flexible, if someone wants to do just one issue, they should apply for a co-chair position. Executive work is facilitating. I'm not sure we'll have people applying for all of these. And people will apply for many positions, students won't be able to make those decisions. If people apply for both and get both, what happens then? If people don't understand the executive, we give you more information, we don't change it. I don't think this will work, the executive works collectively and you hold us to account.

Helen Bagshaw: Could make an RO ruling to say you couldn't apply for more than one position. There's provision that if people have a high workload, they can shift stuff. Putting in things saying what an exec officer should do is a good idea, they can still do general stuff.

Hannah Stoddart: All of the sabs have positions, but they also have duties to do general stuff. We already have exec officers with specific portfolios, but we're just formalising what always happens.

James Lamming: These reforms are absolutely vital in terms of improving accountability and getting new people involved. You can compare people against the post. I believe exec officers should run against RON.

Jo Lee Morrison: Chris was basically saying that JCR committees are rubbish, and that we should have OUSU run as an oligarchy.

Niklas Albein-Svenson: The problem is people not knowing what the student union is or what it does, it's not going to be changed by the fact that we change the names. This does just happen with political institutions, shouldn't suddenly think that this is a structural problem.

Aidan Randle-Conde: I'm not entirely sure what views the OUSU Executive are there to represent. I think this is good for accountability.

Emma Norris: Having specific functions does not stop people taking action as a whole. I think this makes it more attractive regarding people running. Does make things more inflexible for the part-time executive, but it makes things much better for the students.

MTV

MTV Passes

Alan Strickland: If you want to transfer control over who does what from the executive to the students, vote for this.

Chris: We've got something resembling JCR committees already. Don't think this can work in practise.

Motion clearly passes.

Motion 3 Appointments Board

Helen: Think Maria should be on appointments board.

Move to debate:

Benny Spooner: There's a risk of a slippery slope.

Move to vote

Clearly passes.

Motion 4

Council delegates:

Helen Bagshaw: Since we disaffiliated from the NUS, don't think there's been much point in them. They don't represent the majority of Oxford students.

Martin McClusky: If we do centrally affiliate, we'd have to bring this back.

Helen Bagshaw: I think that's opinion.

Chris Allan: Block of 33 votes of exec and delegates, is there any evidence this exists?

Helen Bagshaw: On some issues there could be a majority vote by OUSU opinion.

Charlynn: Have Council delegates been consulted?

Helen: They've been consulted now.

Iain: How does your consultation point work given that this can't be amended?

Benny Spooner: Why did you misquote the Constitution?

Helen: Thought it wasn't relevant.

Ellie Cumbo: Does it say anywhere in the Constitution that NUS is the sole reason for delegates?

Rob Vance: Was struck out.

Oliver Russell: Do those elected cross campus represent the generality of Oxford students?

Helen: Yes

Iain Simpson: Won't this take over a year to fix if we affiliate to the NUS?

Helen Bagshaw: Yes

Martin McCluskey: This is silly, given we might be affiliating to the NUS.

Ed Maine: If we're going to centrally affiliate to the NUS I think we should redesign the OUSU reps.

Jo Lee Morrison: If we vote the motion down on the grounds that we might centrally affiliate, that's a bad point to make. I'm not sure there exist people who do represent students across the university, not just colleges.

Chris Allan: We've had this debate every 2 years for the last 20 years. It's possible for there to be minority interest groups who won't get a vote otherwise. Maybe we want to rework the delegates concept.

Niklas-Albien Svenson: Political factions exist in every body. All of the things we discuss here are political. Delegates do not represent the OUSU point of view.

Ellie Cumbo: Lack of consultation on this motion, consultation doesn't mean giving someone a warning before you knife them.

Benny Spooner: We seem to be worried that OUSU delegates won't turn up, and at the same time we seem to be worried that they'll be a block vote. Proportional representation gives minorities a voice on OUSU Council.

Emma Norris: I don't think the system we have at the moment allows for minority or special interest groups to be represented. Lets not just give people a free vote.

MTV

Hannah Stoddart: We've discussed this for long enough.

Benny Spooner: These constitutional changes are really important, we need to stop moving to a vote without proper discussion.

MTV passes

Helen: Think this is important

Benny Spooner: We should have some form of proportional representation.

27-19-4

Motion passes first reading.

Motion 5

Equal Opportunities withdrawn.

Other Motions

Motion 1.

Benny Spooner: Don't think should be punished for fulfilling my manifesto pledge.

Iain Simpson: Request for rule of interpretation from the chair, standing orders override regulations don't they?

Dan Simpson: Yes

Iain Simpson: Procedural motion that the motion not be put.

Iain Simpson: We've already established this would make no difference.

Benny Spooner: I disagree.

Procedural motion passes.

Motion not put.

Motion 2

Neela Dolezal: This is a big important event, would be great to have OUSU support it.

Hannah Stoddart: I have £4,500 expenses account to spend on stuff like this which I get from the Higher Education Active Community fund.

Debate

?, Merton: I don't think OUSU needs to have policy on the issues of nuclear warfare. There are other ways to get involved in the community which are not so political. Dubious of this being 'a creative way'. Don't think we should be spending 5% of the budget on this event.

Amendment to strike resolves 4

Frank Hardie (Oriel)

POC: Do we have power to put stuff in OxStu

Chris Allen: We'll just dump the worst features page

In favour: Aaron – anything that reduces the amount of money is good

Against: Aidan

Need to tell students

MTV

Amendment fails to get 20

MTV

Summary speeches: this is a non-political event; not a controversial problem; we're commemorating people who die

Clearly passes

Campaign groups

SFQ

This motion in a response to current groups using intimidation, threats of violence. We want to say this is unacceptable but to be wise and not put OUSU members or staff at risk.

Reads 'Council resolves'

- What implications will this have for groups like pro-top-up fees?
- We've discussed this in the past, without resolution. This motion is only affecting campaigning groups.

- Who would make the interpretation?
- President => ratification or else Council.

- Would putting a poster up be classed as destruction of property?
- POI : Proctors guidelines already cover this.

- Why is this vague?
- To protect us
- Isn't this actually about using our resources?
- Yes

- What about undesirable groups we don't have specific policy on?
- It doesn't affect these

- Is there any known student group you're worried about?
- Not specifically
- What's the difference between campaign groups and societies?
- Proctors registration gives us protection for societies being well behaved.

MTD

Fails

- What does the 'and' mean between i. and ii.
- Both conditions must be satisfied to use photocopiers.

MTD

- Have you been approached by groups that fulfil the above criteria? What is your definition of intimidation?
- Not personally, but other people have raised concerns. We go along with Proctors definition of intimidation.

Opposition

This issue was discussed twice at my college. Was rejected because it would make us a target. Also do we have the right to pass an ideological motion on behalf of all students.

- Not an ideological motion, about the use of OUSU resources
- Police have stressed not to overreact or be too afraid of any groups.
- Just because people are violent doesn't mean we should oppose sensible policy.
- There are friendly direct action groups that we don't want to prejudice.
- Forewarned is forearmed
- I agree with all the sensible people
- This is an ideological motion

- Government money so ultra vires issue
- Direct action should measure intent not result

MTV

Summary – about resources not ideological, please support peaceful expression of free speech

Opposition – This really is ideological

Clearly passes