



council minutes

5th Week Trinity Term 2003
Friday 30th May

Apologies: Nicholas Cole, Mark Wardrop.

a. Minutes of previous meeting

b. Matters arising from the Minutes

Louise R [Univ]: in hustings, Bex Wilkinson said holding Sab.s to account was fundamental - not mental!

L Burton [Wadham]: member of OULC not OULD

M. Girling [SEH]: from SEH not Magdalen.

e. Reports from sabbatical officers.

President

Rents kicking off. Protest well covered in the press. Please believe the rumours that the bursars are conspiring against us. VN + 6% = 50% increase in nominal terms. Our loan will only increase by 12.5 %. This is a real problem.

Protest: 8th week. Bursars final meeting. Affects everyone - current as well as future students. Come to f&f - let's really fight this.

NUS: organising training event. Come along, esp. people on committees this year, next year, co-chairs etc... 4-6pm, Monday and Wednesday (7th Week).

Michael Girling [SEH] Why weren't NUS reps invited to see Mandy Telford?

A: Because of nature of meeting. Not practical. Focussed on Edd's report which had been passed in council.

Vice President (Finance)

Catalogue for OUSU shop on the table, as displayed by Andrew Copson.

Printing of OxStu- mistake on page 5, hoping for refund.

C.harles Hotham [SEH] shouldn't you be pushing for more, if this had been a professional newspaper...

Point of Information: OxStu is a professional newspaper

[laughter]

A: Will push to get as much as we can.

Vice President (Welfare)

Read my report - all laid out. College inequality and equal opp review is the key.

Vice President (Women)

Promoting Choice up and running again: 3.30 Thursday in OUSU (Thomas Hull House)

Vice President (Graduates)

4th Year fees renegotiation - keeping a close eye. Could you find out about continuation fees in your colleges and pass on the info.

Dominic Curran [St Hugh's]: You're working part-time. Were you aware of this when you husted?

A: Thought it was given- since already involved in a course - and it's only for four weeks.

Dominic Curran [St Hugh's]: Leave working part time. Were you aware of this when you hustled?

A: Thought it was given- since already involved in a course - and it's only for four weeks.

John Blake (St Hugh's): As RO - thought everyone was aware of the situation.

Vice President (Access & Academic Affairs).

Nothing to add. But could politics, economics and law JCC reps get in touch.

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

John Blake [St. Hugh's]: As RO- can stand for OUSU Exec. Election in 7th week council.

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: Need a co-chair for Women's Campaign. And if you have any suggestions for Community please email.

g. Emergency Motions

Will Straw (New): Procedural motion: move discussion of g.l. to the end as Laura West is currently rowing.

Passes

h. passage of motions Nem Con:

m.1. RO's Report (Hilary Term)

m.3. Graduate Fees

m.4. Colleges Advisors

j. first reading of Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders.

j.1. In Camera Exec Minutes.

Speech in proposition of the motion

Will Straw (New): New motion following Council in 1st Week. Does not restrict what can be in camera but makes it harder.

No opposition

Passed

j.2. Graduate Representation

Speech in proposition of the motion

Will Straw (New): Mostly tidying up rather than dramatic changes. Amendments of note are:

a) to give Grad exec officers a vote in PGA – VP (Grads) Chairs but has no vote.

b) Grad Guide bi-annual, not much changes from edition to edition.

Short factual questions to the proposer of the motion.

Dominic Curran (St. Hugh's): Why no RON in graduate Exec Election?

A: comes from Andy Garlick's draft. Was taken to PGA in Hilary Term

Debate

Amendment: **Strike G7: 7.4 and replace with: "Elections of officers in Postgraduate Assembly will be ratified at the next meeting of OUSU Council"**

Proposed: Andrew Copson (Balliol) Seconded: Ros Dampier (St. Hilda's)

No opposition

Passed

Amendment: **Strike Article I. 2 and replace with:**

"2a. All graduate members of OUSU shall be voting members of

Amendment: **Strike Article I. 2 and replace with:**

"2a. All graduate members of OUSU shall be voting members of Postgraduates Assembly.

b. The OUSU Sabbatical Officers shall be non-voting members of PGA"

Proposed: Andrew Copson (Balliol) Seconded: Ros Dampier (St.Hilda's)

Andrew Copson [Balliol]: OUSU constitution urges to get as many people as possible in forums where they can be representatives. Can't have one-member-one vote in council as it is impractical, but this is the ideal we are aiming for. It is possible in PGA. So we should support a move to give the body broader voices. - it is possible here to obtain full democracy.

Will Straw [New]: Worried, not had a single quorate PGA. Only need 15. 15 people could turn up from one common room and pack the meeting. If quoracy isn't working the solution is to lower it.

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: Have attended PGA where they did discuss it. Need reps not individuals. 10 MCR reps present, is a happier situation than 30 individuals. Mandates work to improve democracy. One-member-one vote in OUSU Council? Doesn't look very nice when you follow it through - would be like opening "floodgates".

Andrew Copson [Balliol]: Easier to get people to come if ANYONE can come - themselves as 'graduates of oxford'. OUSU and PGA are not comparable. Things still need to be ratified following PGA. PGA is more comparable to campaigns and committee meetings.

John Blake [St. Hugh's]: I agree with AC. MCR reps can come to OUSU! The fact that they don't is a shame.

Point of info [that isn't really one] from AC: Grads are less close to their MCR's, as such individuals become better able to be represented by themselves.

JB: packing a PGA smacks of unlikely conspiracy theorists. It doesn't happen in campaigns, it won't happen here. However if 90 people came to a campaign it would be jolly nice.

Move to a Vote

Summation speeches

Andrew Copson [Balliol]: Grads have a different relationship with CR's - OUSU council retains its oversight - so not a problem with packing meetings. It is possible to maintain a full democracy - this is what we should be about.

Will Straw [New]: let's not allow packing. Not excluding, just ensuring only certain people get to vote.

Passed

Amendment: **To strike from resolves 4 Article C.I "and who can work part time if necessary."**

Proposed: Andrew Copson (Balliol) Seconded: Melanie Marshall (Christ Church)

Andrew Copson [Balliol]: VPG no different from other sabs. No reason why you should focus on it. VPG has a lot of work to do, possibly more than other sabs.

If the problem is getting people to stand this still isn't going to work. The electoral system is not ideal for grads. Better fitted to under-grads. But this is part of a bigger structural prob. This is random and foolish!

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: addressing issue of finding a candidate. Not a permanent solution. Have in past taken someone as part-time, have currently. If only a p-t is available - is better than none.

Won't get a VPG if someone leaves mid-office. Of course there is nothing to prevent them being f-t.

Will Straw [New]: echo Sean. Can cope with p-t VPG, Have managed. Not going to be woefully stretched.

Andrew Copson [Balliol]: job of VPG has not been successfully done without a f-t VPG. It hasn't been good enough. No full-time grad rep in OUSU is far from ideal and shouldn't be constitutionalised. Plus- this is not unique to VPG. Anyone could leave mid office for the reasons AG did. They were not grad specific. And all other VP roles would be equally hard to fill with a full-time person.

Sonia Sodha [St Hilda's]: agree with andrew. Nothing unique to grads. Do best I can at grad student advice - but not the same as a full-time grad as point of contact.

Dominic Curran [St. Hugh's]: doesn't like undefined 'if necessary'. Would we be obliged to elect f-t when p-t also standing?

Dominic Curran [St. Hugh's]: doesn't like undefined 'if necessary'. Would we be obliged to elect f-t when p-t also standing?

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: clear that grads feel disenfranchised. To constitutionalise a p-t VPG would lead to further disenfranchisement.

John Blake [St Hugh's]: SUs have short term memory. While we know now why it looks like a good idea to have this provision - might come a time when a p-t is assumed to be the ideal above a f-t. Standing orders are the memory of the SU.

Chris Griffin [Brasenose]: doing a taught course. Couldn't do f-t. Better to have some provision rather than none at all.

Will Straw: discussed in PGA. They want to see it put through. Reject amendment.

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: disputes Will given past argument given about quoracy. If PGA was inquorate then it is as relevant as 'a talk in the pub after council'. Echoes John. Need to be clear on our ideal- don't want to constitutionalise a non-ideal.

Move to a Vote

Summation speeches

Andrew Copson [Balliol]: This is not a uniquely grad issue. Only ever been one resignation specific to VPG. Can happen to any position and all are going to be equally hard to fill mid term. John was right about standing orders being an SU's memory. This is a worthy sentiment but it is not rightly expressed. - job share-

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: we've been doing it already and PGA is happy with this proposal. Good to have it in the rules. Only ever p-t if ft is not available. P-t is better than no one. Entirely sensible. Other arguments don't work for me. Please pass rule change, sensible thing to do, grads in favour, done it in the past, please allow exec to act constitutionally.

For: 36

Against: 28

Abstentions: 10

Passed

Debate

Dominic Curran [St Hugh's]: Concern with no provision of RON. Curious and unjustified. What about lunatics and unsuitable candidates.

Sonia Sodha [SEH]: equivalent to elections in council - a bi-election.

Andrew Copson [Balliol] no RON is consistent with other OUSU protocol.

Move to Vote

Will Straw [New]: vote for it.

Dominic Curran [St Hugh's]: ok. But not sure about RON

Passed

j.3. Election Rules

Speech in proposition:

Melanie Marshall [Christ Church]: Not dogmatically attached to this. Would have preferred possibility of more discussion, encourages amendments. Please can council discuss this and think carefully about it.

Most obvious changes - RO and Junior Tribunal timing - useful and ensures impartiality.

A lot of housekeeping. - difficulties with by-elections.

Re-registration of activists: last year was only year we haven't had them. Without registration it is guess work.

Students with disabilities: should be obvious

General manager - doesn't see need to be on tribunal. Should avoid politicisation of staff.

Commend motion to you, but also commend a hearty debate.

Short Factual Questions to the proposer of the motion:

Dominic Curran [St Hugh's]: possibility of Michaelmas RO report?

A: unlikely

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: note clerical error of numbers.

A: unlikely

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: note clerical error of numbers.

Amendment: **Strike council resolves 35**

Proposed: Ros Dampier [St Hilda's] Seconded: Emily Woodhouse [St Hilda's]

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: not a strong inclination. But something council should make a decision on. Contentious and views are split. Misleading versus irrelevant. Argument in favour is that electorate should make own decision about what is relevant not OUSU.

Chair: two min ruling

Sonia Sodha [St Hilda's]: Bad thing. Says to electorate that this is the most important thing about a candidate. Shouldn't be their sole choice.

John Blake [St Hugh's]: Does anyone know what we're talking about?

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: [explains referring to standing orders] re: political affiliation, expulsions from council, censoring etc..

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: None of these things listed are the most imp thing about a candidate. Means that OUSU is directing what our decisions should be based on. Should be encouraging people to read manifestos.

Melanie Marshall [Christ Church]: don't feel strongly but -practical reasons - eg. Ballot paper v long

Ed Watkins [Keble] political affiliations can be misleading. OULC are not pro-top up fees. If LL took con party line on homosexuality she would have no friends. And Ed and Marcus are not the same.

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: suddenly annoyed and passionate. It is the electorate's choice to vote irresponsibly. But when George Callahan- notorious OUCA member ran as 'free Tibet now'- people weren't unhappy with GC they were upset with being misled by OUSU.

We ask it before hustings, we put it in the JMB. We think it is important, it should be on ballot paper. Anyway - if truly irrelevant, then doesn't matter is it's there!

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: of course it's relevant- last thing voter sees. Person can be interested in party politics nationally and feel they are irrelevant in OUSU. Dangerous if on ballot paper.

John Blake [St Hugh's]: can deduce from political groups, but not sure what you can deduce. But on other point, only certain people can be censured in council - unfair advantage to those who can't.

Point of Information: Ros Dampier [St Hilda's] an erroneous decision by former chair of council

John Blake [St Hugh's]: I'm sweating to death, about to pass out, seriously sunburnt.

Sonia Sodha [St Hilda's]: all still available in JMB

Sarojini McKenna [Trinity]: party political affiliations are important. People want to know

Andrew Copson [Balliol]: there is nothing wrong with giving people information

Louise Radnofsky [Univ]: sorry that it's so embarrassing to be a member of the conservative party. But it is important.

Mote to a vote

Summation Speeches:

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: if it's so imp to read JMB make a code - force them to read it in order to figure out who's who! Until then- need to have it there. Not up to OUSU to say how people should vote, but imp to provide people with info they want.

Sonia Sodha [St Hilda's]: JMB already provides this info. Experience is as important - this encourages irresponsible voting.

FOR: 31

AGAINST: 32

ABSTENTIONS: 2

Recount

FOR: 29

AGAINST: 36

ABSTENTIONS: 2

FOR: 29
AGAINST: 36
ABSTENTIONS: 3

Fails

Amendment: **Replace council resolves 35 with:
In SO C4d to strike Clause 4 and replace with:
"The disclosures made under C.2.f(i) above shall appear on the ballot paper,
together with the note that the candidate in question has no control over
the appearance of the disclosures."**

Proposed: Ros Dampier (St.Hilda's) Seconded: Emily Woodhouse (St.Hilda's)

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: political affiliations on ballot papers but nothing else.

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: point of order- move not to be put- already been decided last time.

Tom Hart [Univ]: what are we talking about?

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: already decided, had this debate. Know what the outcome will be if people are consistent.

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: not true. MM pointed out practicalities.

VOTE FAILS

Move to Vote:

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: very similar, already discussed.

Sean Sullivan [SEH] [confused look on face] want to be clear about what this amendment is doing. Need to be clear.

Passes

Summation Speeches:

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: not sneaky. Explicit. Addresses practicality issue. A good thing for political aff to be there.

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: thinks we've already discussed this.

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: recorded vote - need to be thinking of the interests of the members. Important to let CRs know. Important issue.

Sonia Sodha [St Hilda's]: we discuss a lot of imp issues.

Fails

Amendment Fails

Amendment: **Add to council resolves 5: "such permission shall only be required if the student standing for office will require time out from their studies, and not if their course will have been completed before they commence their job."**

Proposed: Ros Dampier (St.Hilda's) Seconded: Emily Woodhouse (St.Hilda's)

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: [reads it aloud]

Andrew Copson [Balliol]: not sure if this is the case, but this could be a condition from the university.

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: univ could be challenged over this now. The clause is contradictory. Shouldn't have to seek permission from your tutors to do a job which commences after your degree finishes. Inappropriate.

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: understands point of view of univ. takes up a lot of time to run.

Melanie Marshall [Christ Church]: clarify- everything has to be passed by JCC in the case that there turns out to be a legal implication.

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: response to Sean. Many things take up time

Melanie Marshall [Christ Church]: clarify- everything has to be passed by JCC in the case that there turns out to be a legal implication.

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: response to Sean. Many things take up time.

MOVE TO A VOTE.

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: sensible. We're adults, our decision

PASSES

Amendment: **strike resolves 8,16,17 and 19.**

Proposed: Ros Dampier (St.Hilda's) Seconded: Emily Woodhouse (St.Hilda's)

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: reads it aloud.

Melanie Marshall [Christ Church]: bringing back what was in about activists before last year

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: don't feel either way - makes it easier for RO

Melanie Marshall [Christ Church]: no prob with registering apart from hassle. Means activists have to be asked specifically/give consent. Easier to track down when people are cooperating with campaigning and shouldn't be. At present could run joint campaign and would be hard to prove.

Makes redress easier.

MTV.

Amendment Falls

PROCEDURAL MOTION

John Blake [St Hugh's]: oh god, long sigh.

WS: changing order of business. Bringing Budget up. Important for as many people as poss to be here.

Ros Dampier: disruptive and confusing

John Blake [St Hugh's]: elected reps should stay - that's what they're here for

CHAIR: refrain from bad behaviour in council

VOTE ON PROCEDURAL. PASSES.

k. The Budget or Amended Budget

PROCEDURAL MOTION: move to 7th week

Point of Order: Sean Sullivan [SEH]: constitutionally impossible?

Point of Order: Andrew Copson [Balliol]: supposed to come to 3rd week! Hasn't - therefore whole thing is already unconstitutional.

Will Straw [New]: You can table any motion.

Hardip Dhesi [St Johns] haven't had time to take it to JCRs. No mandate.

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: that's how it works .always the case. Important to discuss it now. 7th week is never the most productive council - esp Trinity term. Use common sense and judgement.

VOTE ON PM. FAILS.

Speech_in_proposition:

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: explanation- covers next years budget, will be amended in Hilary by Digo. This is predictive text [so to speak].

Want to make very clear to council our financial status. Lost £85000 over last 2 years. OUSU's reserves are depleted - point of them was partially the move to Thomas Hull House. JCC instructs us to look carefully at our budget. If we go bust - taken over by university. Office in wellington sq, dictate what we can/can't have. Need a surplus to make some contribution to our losses. £8000 not magnificent but a start. Sets us on a path.

- cost cutting: cheapest services, but keep the quality. Saved surprisingly large amounts this year.

- subs increase- 80p per OUSU member is a significant rise, but subs haven't increased above inflation in past 6years.

- budget cuts- esp campaigns. And some publications. Not desirable but necessary.

Personal view- not in favour of subs increase- there will be CRs who can't afford it. This will lead

inflation in past 6years.

- budget cuts- esp campaigns. And some publications. Not desirable but necessary.

Personal view- not in favour of subs increase- there will be CRs who can't afford it. This will lead to disaffiliation. 80p is as high as we can go.

Don't mean to sound stubborn or uncaring but cuts to expenditure is something people will have to deal with.

Certain headings can't be cut- eg sabs heading - but we don't need seven sabs. I'll be gone but council has to review structures. Understands, not keen to consider costs but have to be realistic. Necessary is the key.

Any member of council can amend the budget - but have to keep the surplus. Some headings which you'd be unadvised to touch - eg. Insurance, heat and light. Please don't leave us cold and in the dark.

Be warned about disaffiliation if subs increase.

Short Factual Questions to the Proposer of the motion:

James Coatsworth [Mansfield]: what will cost of disaffiliated colleges to go to freshers fair? And can those who disaffiliate later be made to pay?

A: charges will be made to disaff bodies but not of those who disaff later.

Louise Radnofsky [Univ]: why do we need to create a surplus?

A: irresponsible not to.

Richard Davies [Jesus]: how do you go about 'getting rid of a sab'?

A: involves constitutional change - bring motion to council.

Dominic Curran [St Hugh's]: are we contractually tied down to 7 sabs for next year.

A: yes, and have to act fast, because after mich it'll be for next two years.

Sarojini McKenna [Trinity]: do you think we can get more grants?

A: prob is they are year on year. Not guaranteed.

Point of Information: Sonia Sodha [St Hilda's]: grants are ringfenced.

Omar Salem [st hugh's]: do we have reserves?

A: yes but they're committed.

Hinesh Rajani [Merton]: why aren't univ grants rising with inflation?

A: Figures are slightly distorted. Also grants don't work like that.

Omar Salem [St Hugh's]: can we have figure for reserves?

A: no

Helen McCabe [st hilda's]: why no heading for mature students?

A: an oversight

Louise Radnofsky [univ]: do shop staff need to be reviewed in same way as sabs?

A: issue with shop is we can't afford redundancy. Sabs have cost a lot more than shop has.

Sarojini McKenna [trinity]: why loss of nightbus funding?

A: G&S bought bus - we sub it.

Laurie Burton [Wadham]: where did 80p come from?

A: long exec meetings. Going beyond would lead to disaff. Under - wouldn't make enough difference.

Debate:

Amendment: **New budget heading: 'Mature Students' to receive £50 from Graduate Campaigns; £20 from Disability Action**

No objections

PASSES

Amendment: **Raising the subs by an extra 20p will generate £3200 in income.**

PASSES

Amendment: **Raising the subs by an extra 20p will generate £3200 in income. To raise the Eq opps campaign budgets back to their original level requires £770**

The student advice service requires £650 (total £1420)

The living out guide gets £1500

The remainder (£280) goes to F&F

Proposed by Helen Lewis (St Peter's) Seconded by Laurie Burton (Wadham)

Helen Lewis [st peter's]: cutting welfare and equal opps is false economy. This in itself would lead to disaffiliation.

Laurie Burton [Wadham]: think why students would disaff. Cutting things is more problematic.

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: 80p is bad enough. A 20% increase on that is immense. Some Crs will find it easy - others won't. shouldn't be covering our financial problems by asking JCRs to review their. Need to look internally before begging externally.

Plus don't like where this motion proposes money goes.

Andrew Copson [Balliol]: welfare categories. Living out guide- not able to be produced in current form on this budget. LOG already has some advertising. Don't know impact if produced in current proposed budget form. Stu. Advice reduction depends how you conceptualise it. Takes chunks of time out of sabs time.

Move to Vote:

Hardip Dhesi [st johns]: don't yet know if CRs will disaff from subs increase

Laurie Burton [Wadham]: agrees - but got to think why people would disaff.. Core service reduction worse than subs increase.

FAILS

Procedural Motion: Will Straw [New]: to take motion in parts.

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: unworkable.

FAILS.

Omar Salem [St Hugh's]: f and f deals with battles. Compare a 20p rise to excessive battles increase.

Helen McCabe [st hilda's]: increase for welfare is needed.

Duncan Cowan-Gray [worcester]: need to have mentality of JCR which may disaff. OUSU is seen as a safety net. 20p would tip the balance.

Tom Goodhead [magdalen]: won't be able to justify this to the JCR. Not responsible of OUSU to raise subs, when fighting against rent increases.

Oliver Morrison [new]: need to re-open discussion on surplus. If the rise leads to disaff, OUSU could potentially lose even more.

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: can't guess who would disaff. Council has to decide what college responses will be. It's easy to convince ourselves that OUSU is worth it - harder to convince uninterested people.

Bex wilkinson[seh]: got to remember this amendment isn't only about sub increase, but is also very specific about where the money goes. If this goes through, we have bound ourselves completely to giving money to these headings and only these headings. Laurie Burton [wadham]: OUSU is good value for money.

Ros Dampier [St Hilda's]: block grant goes to colleges - gets filtered. We're not 'taking money away', just redirecting it where it's needed, hear disaff rumours all the time - vastly more likely to come to something if services decrease.

Hinseh Rajani [Merton]: council is skewered. The CRs who aren't here are the ones most likely to disaffil.

James Coatsworth [Mansfield] don't know why but I trust Sean on this one.

Will Straw [New]: two points to make. 1) everything mentioned on the back of your voting card will still be there at 80p rise- but may be reduced. 2) big diff between 80p and £1.

Move to Vote:

BK [Christ Church]: bored

John Blake [St Hugh's]: job of council to discuss this

FAILS.

BK [Christ Church]: bored
John Blake [St Hugh's]: job of council to discuss this
FAILS.

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: reiterate point- not losing services merely cutting back, not attractive but got to be realistic. 80p is already significant. £1 will lead to inevitable disaffil. This is a gritted teeth increase already.

Sheila T [st hilda's]: this is conjecture. We have no facts - we are just guessing reactions.

Sarojini McKenna [trinity]: true we don't know anything yet. Abstain on amendment then reject the budget.. I think OUSU is value for money, but we need to know what everyone else thinks. Need a PR campaign.

John Blake [St Hugh's]: interested by the idea that no Worcester student uses the equal opps campaign. Interesting that they have no; women, international students or gay students. We are sadly debating this without any idea. But should put subs up and then exec will go into JCR meetings and argue the case. I have nothing better to do with my Sunday evening as I have no life.

Procedural Motion: Dominic Curran [St Hugh's]: Table Motion

Will Straw: what you need to do is simply vote against it then bring it back next week.

CHAIR: you want to table motion. I think it's poss, as does Sonia, as does john. Will?

Will Straw [New]: yes if council agrees.

Dominic Curran [St Hugh's]: we've discussed it a lot but it still needs to go to JCRs

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: I'm surprised if JCR pres have no understanding of how their common rooms will react. We are all reps. We might as well have the debate and vote.
FAILS.

MTV on budget.

James Coatsworth [Mansfield]: I need to sleep

Laura West [St Catz]: I do too, but lets carry on.

PASSES. 39, 10, 1

Summation Speech:

Helen Lewis [St Peter's]: vote for this but reject the budget

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: we will have disaffiliations. Plus I reject where it's going. Not necessary for f&f, plus LOG can be produced in current budget - all we'd be paying for is a glossy cover. This amendment should fall.

Fails

Lousie Radnofsky [Univ]: no confidence in the chair

John Blake [St Hugh's]: this is not a pantomime.

Melanie Marshall [Christ Church]: this is important. Needs to be chaired efficiently and with care.

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: waste of time. If people behaved in council we could get things done.

FAILED

Move to Vote:

John Blake [St Hugh's]: JCR pres want to discuss this

Hinesh Rajani [Merton]: JCR pres should already know. - plus, drunken finalists in 7th week council.

Passes

Summation Speeches:

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: difficult to summarise because people want to take it back to common rooms. Like budget. Vote for it.

Sarojini McKenna [Trinity]: needs to go back to JCRs. Have to know what the result will be.

VOTE. 17, 32, 4

FAILS

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: quick point. If you want someone to come and speak email us.

Abby Green [Wadham]: thanks to Sean

Sean Sullivan [SEH]: quick point. If you want someone to come and speak email us.
Abby Green [Wadham]: thanks to Sean

BACK TO MOTION ON ELECTION REGS

j. first reading of Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders.

Amendment 7 from amendment sheet withdrawn

Amendment: **Add to council resolves 20 after 'close of nominations.':
"and shall also display the candidates JMB entries, as soon as possible and at
least 2 working days prior to the JMB going to press."**

Proposed: Ros Dampier (St.Hilda's) Seconded: Emily Woodhouse (St.Hilda's)

No Opposition. **Passes**

Amendment: **Add to council resolves 21 after 'shall be an electoral offense':
"This rule shall apply to cross-campus by-elections for un-filled sabbatical
posts."**

Proposed: Ros Dampier (St.Hilda's) Seconded: Emily Woodhouse (St.Hilda's)

Ros Dampier (St.Hilda's): clarifies rules on collusion between candidates, applies to bi-elections.
Makes sense.

No opposition
Passes

Chair: Amendment 10 from amendment sheet withdrawn

MTV

Summation Speeches:

Melanie Marshall [Christ Church]: sorry, boring, but was asked for. Really good. Vote for it.

No Opposition
PASSES.

g. Emergency Motions

g.I. Entz Handbook

Ros Dampier (St.Hilda's): why emergency?

Chair: Because it made sense

Speech in Proposition:

Stuart Colville [queens]: small publication. Financially viable - profitable even. Adhoc committee,
and would be good.

Short Factual Questions:

Abby Green [Wadham]: why viable?

A: because

Charles Hotham [SEH]: why have the motion?

A: to keep council informed

Laurie Burton [Wadham]: is it a council decision?

A: yes

No Opposition
PASSES

m. Other Motions

m.2. Report of the OUSU Admissions working party.

Speech in Proposition:

Sonia Sodha [St Hilda's]

- Introduce AWP and report. Recognises there are two problems:
 - Ensuring representative applications to Oxford
 - Ensuring the admissions system is as fair as possible
- Most of report fairly uncontroversial. Looks at outreach work that goes on, makes a some recommendations eg better targeting of teacher, more proactive targeting of media by university. Abolition of form and fee.
- Most important recommendation is more co-ordinated admissions system. Our current admissions system has two flaws:
 - There is the perception it is unfair in terms of personal links and contacts, both in independent and maintained sector. Give eggs of both independent and state schools going wrong.
 - In a time of rising applications and widely fluctuating numbers applying to each college (use eg of Magd) it is hard to ensure that the best applicants get in from the year group as a whole.
- At the same time college choice is important. Maintaining college preference maintains incentive for outreach work. System proposed is best of both worlds. It maintains college preference. But most importantly, it is FAIR to applicants.
- What are the current problems with our system?
 - Number of applicants in each subject each year varies widely.
 - Admissions tutors acknowledge it is difficult to ensure the best from a year group get in rather than the best from each college-sized pocket of applicants. NO GATHERED FIELD.
 - The current mechanisms don't work. Sending people to colleges for 2nd interview – v ad hoc. Some subjects have groups some don't. Some work better than others. But some candidates who should perhaps be interviewed at other colleges not even invited for interviews at their college of first choice.
 - Some colleges already engage in ad hoc redistribution schemes. So if too many applicants pass on some applicants to another college. Why don't we do this?
- Problems with redistribution. Can't work because candidates from biggest colleges want to redistribute the weakest candidates rather than the candidates who should be getting in – they want the choice when they interview. But colleges with fewer applicants don't want to accept weak candidates. No system of redistribution which will satisfy everyone. Found this out this year from trying to create redistribution schemes in the Ad Working Party.
- System proposed is the only one which allows a GATHERED FIELD which is compatible with all colleges potentially agreeing to it.
- Outline system:
 - Candidates apply to the university, can state college pref
 - Faculty interviews all candidates. Interviewing done in groups of 2-3 using agreed interview formats, agreed criteria and agreed system of scoring. Interviewers not aware of college pref – assessing candidates solely

- faculty interviews all candidates. Interviewing done in groups of 2-3 using agreed interview formats, agreed criteria and agreed system of scoring. Interviewers not aware of college pref – assessing candidates solely against all others in the yr group.
 - Candidates ranked and scored as a result of interview. Top X admitted to university.
 - College preferences – how these are taken into account.
- Advantages of this system.
 - It's FAIR. Gathered field. No second-guessing of system trying to get in.
 - College preference taken properly into account, unlike redistribution at the mo.
 - More transparent and eliminates perception personal contact useful.
 - Maintains incentive of colleges to undertake outreach work – explain why.
 - Makes promotion of consistency of practice in interviewing by subject much easier.
 - Concerns which may arise:
 - **Tutors have to interview.** No:
 - Point on graduates.
 - Don't teach students that much anyway – increasing specialisation.
 - Helps to create perception tutors select those who they like. Should be objective decision based on academic potential alone.
 - Tutors aren't superhuman – they can't select a year group that will work together on the basis of a couple of interviews. Tutors don't do this and they SHOULDN'T
 - **Candidates should not end up at colleges other than their first choice college – differing rents and tutors**
 - Already happens
 - Could only be solved by separating out colleges – but we are a university
 - Separate problem that OUSU is working on
 - Outreach work
 - Colleges can still do outreach work with particular sector/geographic region.
 - Avoids the problem of attracting lots of applications in same subject. Also avoids fostering the image that it's all about personal links.
 - Is it possible to rank?
 - Subjects already starting to do this anyway.

Short Factual Questions:

Charles Hotham [SEH]: accommodation during interviews?

A: report doesn't deal with practicalities.

Charles Hotham [SEH]: will it be endorsed?

A: yes. And gov in favour of central system.

James Coatsworth [Mansfield]: deferred entry?

A: work on same basis. But again, a practicality.

Someone from Mansfield: 2nd 3rd pref system?

Sonia: currently misleading. Not actual choices. Merely allocations.

Bridgit Phillipson [Hertford]: how rank candidates?

A: based on actual interview.

Chris Allan [somerville]: useful to stay in your college [?]

A: a practicality.

Chris Allan [somerville]: useful to stay in your college [?]

A: a practicality.

Tom Goodhead [magd]: student numbers not currently set [?]

A: in process of changing, flexibility is already in process of being removed.

Adrian de Froment [New]: interviewers with more than one interviewee?

A: misunderstood - meant interviewer.

Adrian de Froment [New]: prob with tutors time

A: where possible. And very important. 'Best practice'.

Michael Girling [SEH]: agree with principle but what's to stop best college getting all the applications.

A: nothing - moot point.

Louise Radnofsky [Univ]: logistics?

A: procedure is what counts.

Adam Turnbull [balliol]: does report favour any de-summing techniques?

A: all methods tend to be poor for access

Bridgit Phillipson [Hertford]: is the university going to change?

A: maybe.

Debate:

James Coatsworth [Mansfield]: congrats to Sonia but feel the thing is fundamentally flawed. Deferred entry, practicalities not worked out, ranking system seems unworkable - what if people are ranked the same? How are decisions made when people are tied on points? Marvellous opportunity for colleges to stop outreach.

Louise Radnofsky [Univ]: concerns - if you're borderline- interaction in small community can be useful for those from none trad backgrounds.

Sonia Sodha [St Hilda's]: all about academic potential. Simply transferring from a small pool to a large one.

Louise and Sonia have a discussion which no one can hear.

Sonia Sodha [St Hilda's]: to James' point. This is simply about principles. Practicalities come later. Colleges have outreach incentive because they care about the norington table.

MTV

Summation Speeches:

Sonia Sodha [St Hilda's]: vote for it

James Coatsworth [Mansfield]: not ideal at moment, wants to see a new set of proposals.

VOTE: 36, 4, 5-

PASSES

n. Any Other Business

Will Straw [New]: take rubbish with you. We have an exec vacancy. And chair of council.

Andrew Copson [Balliol]: let me know anything about exam schools policing.

THE END.

