

## **OUSU Council Minutes – 7<sup>th</sup> Week Hilary Term 2000**

### **Ordinary Council**

Opened at 3.38pm. Abigail Coates (St Hilda's) in the Chair.

**00/HT7/04 – Minutes of previous meeting.** To be ratified at 1<sup>st</sup> Week TT Council.

**00/HT7/05 – Matters Arising To** be considered at 1<sup>st</sup> Week TT Council

### **00/HT7/06 – Ratifications in Council**

Catherine Wallis (Keble) for Co-chair Third World Action Cmtte –  
Ratified

Liz Disley (Wadham) and Phil Walford (St Annes) for Editors, Oxford Student – Trinity Term. –  
Ratified.

Adam Fleming (Hertford) for Deputy Editor (News and Sport) Oxford Student in Trinity Term –  
Ratified

Jon Worth (Merton) for Freshers Handbook 2000-01  
Ratified

### **00/HT7/07 – Elections in Council**

#### OUSU Council Delegate (1 vacancy)

2 candidates were nominated and husted:

#### Andrew Marshall (Keble)

Catherine Wallis husted on Andrew's behalf and apologised for him as he had an exam. He has experience in many University societies and does a lot of music and acting. He isn't a party political person but feels he can represent ordinary students. He will come to all Councils and participate.

#### Vivienne Raper (Mansfield)

She wants to be part of the body that decides things. She will serve and represent the power invested in her. She would like to hold the executive to account. She has immense commitment and has been the Labour Club's Women's Officer this term. She is conscientious and she now has an idea what is going on. Has organised Women's Teas and Dinners

#### Questions

Dan Waites (St Annes) asked who the candidates felt they would represent?

CW – all people especially as he is not party political

VR – feel I represent a balanced view

Eleanor Fletcher (Worcester) asked that candidates views on the attendance level for Council?

CW – AM promised to turn up to all Councils especially as this was the only thing he had to do.

VR – I would always turn up unless something awful happened to me.

Adam Killea (Balliol) asked the candidates if this election should be an Election in Council or a 'cross campus' ballot?

CW – couldn't speak for AM on this issue

VR – wants OUSU to be as democratic as possible.

Council Voted. The Returning Officer later declared that Andrew Marshall (Keble) had been elected as Council Delegate.

### **00/HT7/08 – Passage of Motions nem-con**

Motion 15 – OUSU Press Officer

### **Reports were considered in Termly Council**

#### **No emergency motions**

### **00/HT7/09 – Motions of no-confidence or censure**

Vicki Tomlinson (BNC) said that the motion to no confidence Gavin Lightfoot, formerly of the Exec, should be done as he gave John Storey a very unfair description.

Dan Waites (St Annes) - Point of Order – that the motion be not put as it is irrelevant and a waste of time. Carried on a show of hands.

**The motion was accordingly binned.**

### **00/HT7/10 – The Budget or Amended Budget**

Alex Freudmann (Magdalen) said that this year things are tight but should break even. Please ask any questions.

- How much was paid out to retiring staff members? £10,000 was paid to Jean Haywood on the basis of our policy on retirement.
- Was any payment made to Ann Shepherd? Unknown – AF said he would find out.
- Is the £450 budgeted for Finance and Funding cmtte still too low, especially given last year's wild underestimation and the actual sum being £650? This figure is a prediction and he would keep tabs on what needed to be spent. Paul Campy certainly made mistakes.
- Why has one committee budget been raised from £6 to £100? There is less room for a committee to manoeuvre if you start from such a low figure. Agreed to give each committee a realistic minimum.
- How much revenue is gained from advertising? About £160,000

**The Amended Budget was then passed nem-con.**

### **00/HT7/11 – Motions authorising capital expenditure**

#### Motion 1 – Megaphone

Anneliese Dodds (St Hilda's) said that this purchase would stop money being wasted on hiring one every time.

**Motion passed nem-con**

#### Motion 2 – ISDN

Alex Freudmann (Magdalen) said that OUSU was spending over £200 in petrol each term in taking the OxStu to the printers in Telford. The line would also have other uses.

- When would it be installed? Within the next two weeks.
- What about ASDL instead of ISDN? Considered it but out printers are not likely to change off ISDN for the next few years.
- What are the running costs? Cost of an ordinary phone call.
- Software upgrades? Come free
- Any restrictions with being on the University network? None

## **Motion passed nem-con**

### **00/HT7/12 – Other Motions**

#### Motion 1 – Outline Proposal to give voting rights to University Societies

Laurence Norman (Keble) said the motion stemmed from disillusion with OUSU and a need to change what is going on in Council. People wanted Council to be much more open and democratic. This motion is designed to debate the principle rather than get bogged down in technical constitutional changes. There is a perception that OUSU is dominated by a left-wing political clique and there aren't any other cleavages – like sport, music etc- which students can use to gain representation.

SFQ:

- Why only one delegate per society? No real reason – willing to listen to Council's opinion on this.
- How many societies in Oxford? Don't know
- What sort of societies would get chance to representation? Only those registered with the Proctors.

Opposition: Tony Lord (Wadham) said the motion was sloppily written and did not make clear whether it would force us to change the Constitution or not.

Amendment proposed to alter the motion to make the distinction clear. Laurence Norman accepted.

Antonia Bance (Somerville) opposed the motion as only lots of people who should turn up to Council never do and what makes you think these people will.

Ben Harris (St Hugh's) - this motion would skew representative democracy. Council will become like the House of Lords. Will religious groups then be demanding representation?

Simon Basey (Corpus) - it is important we represent students but this motion only duplicates representation.

Costas Pateras (St John's) - too many societies operate undemocratically – this will be a problem.

Sonia Sodha (St Hilda's) – there is a fundamental flaw in the motion but she didn't say what it was

Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) - because all you need is one 'bonkers' don to become a 'society' it is a great way of gaining representation by the back door. Great potential for abuse.

Alice Hodgson (New) - college control was an issue in the referendum and students backed that principle.

Caroline Dodds (Corpus) - this will not improve representation as it is just duplicating student's access to Council.

Matthew Taylor (St Benet's) said that this would mean every society and brand of religion could get representation. This would be a bad thing.

Jason Dorsett (Oriel) said that JCR's/MCR's/SU's funded OUSU but these societies do not.

Dan Waites (St Annes) moved an amendment to scrap part c of resolves and replace it with his wording. This was designed to cover the 'bonkers don' problem.

Jason Dorsett opposed the amendment saying it would make no difference to the principles of the motion and they should be opposed.

Amendment defeated.

Laurence Norman (Keble) said that people could quite easily rotate from each council. There are ways of dealing with the practical problems.

Move to a vote (MTV) – carried

Council then voted:

For – 7

Against – lots

Abs – 4

**The motion was accordingly defeated**

#### Motion 2 – Voting Rights at Council

Amended in the same way as Tony Lord proposed in Motion 1

John Courouble (Campion Hall) said this would enable more people who are interested to have a vote. 43% expressed their dissatisfaction with OUSU's structures and that still needs addressing. This motion asks the exec to go away and think about new ways of getting more people to council and voting from JCRs etc.

SFQ:

- Any incentives? Fixed number of votes and this is based on a minimum turnout from college.
- Are the numbers too big? Hope that people would turn up
- JCR's to be disenfranchised if the minimum number don't turn up? No

Opposition: Dan Waites (St Annes) said it would just allow whoever turns up to have a vote.

Jason Dorsett (Oriol) proposed an amendment to not allow JCR votes to be transferred during the meeting.

Tony Lord opposed this – its none of our business how JCR's allocate their votes

Vinothan Sangarapillai (St Hugh's) said that JCR constitutions are too vague to force on them how we expect them to select who turns up.

John Courouble (Campion Hall) said that the substitute proposal could actually take us closer to OMOV as you will reduce the number of people coming along. The amendment does not actually relate to the motion's thrust – it is a JCR decision.

MTV – carried

Council voted. Amendment failed

Debate on motion:

Anneliese Dodds (St Hilda's) thought the motion was good but people were getting too bogged down in the minutiae of the motion. The thinking on that could be done later on – all the motion does is ask Exec to go away and think about some proposals.

MTV – carried

Council voted. On a show of hands the motion was carried

### **The motion was accordingly passed**

Procedural Motion – Josh Bell (Oriol) moved that we consider Motion 12 next.

For: 33

Ag: 21

Abs: 1

Failed

### Motion 3 – Accountability through Open Question and Answer Meeting.

Tony Lord amendment as in Motion 1 – accepted.

Laurence Norman (Keble) said this was something we should try.

SFQ:

- How about a trial next term? Yes
- How are you going to do this with exec? 2hrs is not excessive to come and talk to all students.
- Can you take out the Co-chairs as they are only accountable to their committee? Yes – if Council so wants.

Debate:

Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) proposed an amendment to make the time of the meeting between 10 and 5. This would prevent Sabs from having to work outside their hours.

Jason Dorsett (Oriell) opposed saying this wasn't necessary and evening might be the best time.

Amendment withdrawn

Alice Hodgson (New) proposed an amendment to delete Co-chairs from the 'resolves 2'. Co-chairs already give enough time.

Eleanor Fletcher (Worcester) opposed this saying that as Co-chairs can spend money they should be accountable

Antonia Bance (Worcester) - you can't keep tabs on representative committees as they are not accountable to the student body as a whole.

Amendment carried

MTV – carried

Council voted. On a show of hands the motion was clearly carried.

### **The motion, as amended, was accordingly passed**

Procedural Motion to take Motion 12 next. Failed.

#### Motion 4 – Reorganising Elections in Council

John Courouble (Campion Hall) said that elections in council drag on and on, especially in the first part of MT. Lets have a special council to get it out of the way quickly.

SFQ:

- Who will do the jobs until the special council? Nobody
- Is it a constitutional motion? No – only testing the principle before Council.
- Same people entitled to vote? Yes

Opposition: Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) - elections rarely take that long and we should not be making posts vacant for longer than the bare minimum. It also means more effort for people to come to a special council and there are fears it won't be representative. Candidates will have a greater ability to influence if they urge friends to attend when ordinary reps aren't there.

Jason Dorsett (Oriell) - the elections procedure is time consuming but best to be done when everyone is here so that it is fair.

John Courouble (Campion Hall) suggested we could still elect the important posts in 1<sup>st</sup> Week Council.

Anneliese Dodds (St Hilda's) - it would be wrong to start labelling some posts as 'more' or 'less' important. It is not healthy to leave some posts vacant for so long.

MTV – carried

Council voted.

On a show of hands, **the motion was clearly defeated**

#### Motion 5 – Improving Information Flow from OUSU Officials

Dan Waites (St Anne's) - there needs to be more information passed to JCR reps and some of the mystery about what certain jobs involves has to be removed. Things should also be done on paper. He proposed an amendment to this purpose.

Amendment proposed – accepted by Council.

SFQ: None

**The motion, as amended, was passed nem-con**

## Motion 6 – Proposal establishing a Structures Committee

Laurence Norman (Keble) said that this committee will keep people thinking about OUSU is working and can be improved.

SFQ:

- If this an ad hoc committee already, why formalise it? We need to encourage people to bring forward ideas.

Opposition: Jason Dorsett (Oriell) said that Council had already rejected this proposal in TT last year. Any analysis of OUSU's performance day-to-day should be done by Exec. The committee is not needed as ad hoc parties are much more easy to focus and control. The Committee will only tinker about with unimportant parts of the Constitution and then clog up Council in the process. This will give the impression of OUSU debating amongst themselves.

MTV – carried

Council voted:

On a show of hands, **the motion was clearly defeated**

Procedural motion – John Courouble (Campion Hall) moved that Motion 12 be taken next. Carried.

## Motion 12 – Stagecoach

Michael van Gelderen (St Hugh's) said that the content of this motion is the logical conclusion of the motion in Week 1 Council. If Council said we should boycott Stagecoach then this is consistent.

SFQ:

- Where in the articles of association of Stagecoach does it says they are for Section 28? Nowhere.
- Does Brian Souter own over 50% of Stagecoach? No
- Who was at Ethics committee? Those I remember are Anneliese Dodds, Jason Dorsett, Eleanor Fletcher, Alice Hodgson, James Howard and Sacha Ismail.
- What amount of revenue could be made up by a competent Business Manager (BM)? Between 50-70% we reckon.
- Is this motion an anti-environmental motion because it encourages people not to use public transport? No – there are other buses they can use.
- Is the proposer aware that Stagecoach have a special Advisory Board of Directors who deal with Equal Ops? No
- Have Stagecoach ever advertised in the LGB Handbook? Yes

Opposition: Alex Freudmann (Magdalen) - 1<sup>st</sup> Week Council was not about saying that a ban must follow just to be consistent. All it did was state we must refer the issue to Ethics Committee. This was done because it was felt a ban might be a difficult step to take without the facts. The 'consistent' argument is fallacious because we are supposed to looking at the facts and taking a choice.

Further, this motion targets a company in a direct way yet only to get at a man who own about 11% of it in a very roundabout way. £6000 is the amount we would lose which is far too much money to give up. We cannot budget on the basis of good BM performance plus next year we have an extra Sab to pay for. This policy is financially very bad for OUSU. The £6000 is equivalent to 2 or 3 JCR/MCR subscriptions and should not give the impression we are wasting their money.

Matthew Taylor (St Benet's) - Brian Souter is Executive Chairman so he's hands off the day to day running of the Company. He did not donate the money but put it in a trust. We are simply cutting off our own noses by supporting this motion.

Spencer Craig (Keble) - the real issue here is if we support Section 28 or not? What message will it send out if we refuse to take a clear position on this? We need to show clear opposition to Section 28 by supporting the motion.

Laurence Norman (Keble) - what exactly is the ethical issue. Spencer is right in that Section 28 should be scrapped but Brian Souter is not wicked and evil for putting his money into a cause in which he believes.

Josh Bell (Oriell) - this motion is not an issue of supporting Section 28 or not as there are only a few people in this room who probably do support it. If we ban Stagecoach, Oxford students will still be exposed to their advertising

through other means. I would be the first to ban Stagecoach if they were giving the money directly to the cause but they are not – it is a man in his personal capacity. We all make donations that may be contrary to OUSU policy.

Anneliese Dodds (St Hilda's) - Souter's position with Stagecoach is not clear-cut. He is linked to the Company yet if we oppose the motion what we are saying is that no company can be held to account because they are a company. It is Stagecoach that generated his money and keeps adding to his fortune. They could expel him from the company if they cared but they did not. Stagecoach do not want to disassociate themselves from his policy.

We can make money in other ways – just reinvesting the reserves and changing our banking arrangements will bring us lots more revenue. No publications would be cancelled.

Brian Souter himself – you cannot disassociate the man from this act. It is true the money came from a charity but it was his personal charitable foundation. The media have labelled this motion as some kind of 'loony left' crusade but it is not that – we are simply pointing out that the buses are linked inextricably to his fortune. For once, OUSU should really put its principles before money.

Tony Lord (Wadham) said that as VP-Welfare elect he must put aside his principles and look at the practical side of this. Anneliese is wrong to say that it is not about cancelling handbooks or publications – it may come down to this. What sensible organisation will budget for a deficit? We are hurting no one apart from ourselves by doing this.

John Courouble (Campion Hall) - I primarily care for student union sticking to what it believes in. When we put forward the ethical criteria for advertising it was lauded as a great principled idea yet we are now facing the ridiculous situation where OUSU does not mean what it says. Sometimes principles will be against our financial interests and we have to acknowledge that. The OxStu has been very biased in its approach to the motion and it is almost as if it is dictating our agenda for us and bullying people into a position before they hear the debate.

I would far rather work for an institution that believes in itself, not a hypocritical one.

Catherine Wallis (Keble) - we can't as humans let money take precedence over human interest. Our morals and ethics should take precedence and money is not as important as principles.

Michael van Gelderen (St Hugh's) – it is not too much to ask for companies to chuck out directors who are so blatantly bigoted for example the Vice Chairman of Rangers FC. Council holds a strong position on Section 28 and yet the company refuses to distance itself from Souter.

The motion will not bankrupt OUSU and over the next few years the difference will hardly be felt.

Ruth Hunt (St Hilda's) – St Hilda's have a few practical concerns over the motion. When will the ban start? 2<sup>nd</sup> Week of July when the contracts end. Therefore how will we raise media awareness and make sure everyone is aware we are boycotting Stagecoach for a reason? There is no point having a boycott if we don't tell people about it and the reasons why.

James Littlefair (Jesus) – can we hold Stagecoach to account for the conduct of an individual? No – the link between the two is not proven.

Can we make up the money in the future? No – they spend a significant amount of money with OUSU and that will leave a large hole in OUSU finances. No one has said how we can make that money up in a way that is satisfactory.

Alice Hodgson (New) – all our other bans such as Nestle cover 'company' policy yet this isn't a company policy – instead it is the actions of an individual.

Sacha Ismail (Somerville) – it is uncomfortable to hear so many people talk about money. This is an issue of ethical criteria. If we don't think the ban and boycott should be linked then Council should lift its boycott policy.

Jason Dorsett (Oriell) – Stagecoach's activities are not covered by the ethical criteria as their 'company' activities are not directly detrimental to Oxford students.

People say a good BM will make up the money but BM quality is variable and we might have a bad one next year.

The debate should be about how best to campaign for the repeal of Section 28 – not doing this action.

Costas Pateras (St John's) – OUSU never has the bottle to put its neck on the line over so many issues. We should either reverse our policy on the boycott or carry this through to the end.

Ben Harris (St Hugh's) – this is a very difficult issue and one where there is no clear right or wrong. I don't believe the argument that this is a company and he is an individual should let Stagecoach off the moral hook. There is no comparison to providing funds for a political party who supports liberal principles and people's right to liberty and the actions of a man who wants to deny that.

The probity of OUSU is at stake and we are morally bankrupt if we don't follow this policy through to a logical conclusion.

Jo Osborne (St Anne's) – we should not discard our ideals but OUSU still has to operate day to day. Students need the Welfare Handbook and the extra Sab and nothing should put this in jeopardy.

John Steward (Pembroke) – if OUSU passes a ban on this it will receive national media attention. We are morally bankrupt if we don't follow this through and vote for the motion. OUSU has reserves of £250,000 so no services or Sab posts will be cut because of this. Section 28 is wrong and we will be hypocrites if we don't put our money where our mouth is.

Catherine Overton (Somerville) – draw a parallel between Labour's ethical foreign policy and the Stagecoach situation. The two are linked in how we must campaign. A perfect legitimate way is to ban Stagecoach.

MTV – Carried.

Procedural Motion moved to divide Council on a recorded vote. Carried.

The question was that the motion be passed:

Council divided:

For – 29

Against – 24

Abstentions – 6

For

John Courouble – Champion Hall

Spencer Craig – Keble JCR

Anneliese Dodds – OUSU President

Emma Evans – Merton JCR

Dan Hammett – Mansfield JCR

Ben Harris – OUSU Executive

Dan Hughes – OUSU Council Delegate

Ruth Hunt – St Hilda's JCR

Sacha Ismail – OUSU Executive

Gawain Little – St John's JCR

Juliet Kemp – Pembroke JCR

Hanna Kwiatkowska – OUSU Executive

Cat Muge – Wadham SU

Ionut Ottean Dumbrava – Balliol JCR

Catherine Overton – OUSU Council Delegate

Laura Paskell-Browne – St Hilda's JCR

Costas Pateras – St John's JCR

Adam Richardson – St Catz JCR

James Rowlands – Pembroke JCR

Vinothan Sangarapillai – St Hugh's JCR

Matthew Shouler – Merton JCR

Nick Silk – Exeter JCR

Mary Stevens – OUSU Executive

John Steward – Pembroke JCR

Ed Turner – St John's JCR

Michael van Gelderen – Queer Rights Representative Cmtte

Catherine Wallis – Keble JCR

Toby Webber – Wycliffe Hall

Alice Wright – St Hilda's JCR

Against

Colin Anderson – OUSU Executive

Simon Basey – Corpus JCR

T.Bromwich? – Trinity JCR

Jason Dorsett – OUSU VP-Graduates

Christina Edwards – LMH JCR

Alex Freudmann – OUSU VP-Finance

Rachel Griffin – OUSU VP-Women



Andrew Hewitt – Queens JCR  
Alice Hodgson – OUSU VP-Welfare  
Tony Lord – Wadham SU  
Richard McCarthy – OUSU Council Delegate  
R. McGerty – Trinity JCR  
Daniel Moore – OUSU Council Delegate  
Laurence Norman – Keble JCR  
Jo Osborne – St Anne’s JCR  
Rowenna Prist?? – Hertford JCR  
Maria Roche – Jesus JCR  
James Segan – Brasenose JCR  
Sonia Sodha – OUSU Executive  
Rory Stokes – LMH JCR  
Sean Sullivan – Teddy Hall JCR  
Rhodri Thomas – St Anne’s JCR  
Dan Waites – St Anne’s JCR  
Tara Whittaker – OUSU Council Delegate

Abstentions

Antonia Bance – Somerville JCR  
Joel Brookfield – OUSU Executive  
Anthony Fairclough – Somerville JCR  
Eleanor Fletcher – OUSU Council Delegate  
Paul Jobber – Somerville JCR  
Jon Worth - OUSU Executive

**The motion was accordingly passed.**

Motion 7 – Outline Proposal to improve attendance

Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) said the motion allowed people to keep tabs on their representatives and make sure those who are delegated to come to Council actually do so.

SFQ:

- What is a good excuse not to come to Council? We shall wait and see.

**The motion then passed nem-con**

Motion 8 – H.E.Funding

Motion withdrawn

Motion 9 – London Mayoral Race

Matthew Taylor (St Benet’s) said the selection of Frank Dobson was a complete farce and wanted people to vote to uphold democracy.

Dan Waites (St Anne’s) moved that the motion be not put as it isn’t at all relevant to students as students. Failed.

SFQ: None

Opposition: Vinothan Sangarapillai (St Hugh’s) said OMOV was not the only fair system of voting.

MTV – carried.

Council voted. On a show of hands the motion failed to get 20 votes in favour.

## **The motion was accordingly binned**

The Chair re-opened passage of motions nem-con.

### Motions passed nem-con

Motion 10 – Environment Committee

Motion 11 – Regulations to govern ratification of graduate policy.

### Motion 13 – OUSU Finances

Anneliese Dodds (St Hilda's) – this motion gives us the wherewithal to consult with experts and the give Council a range of informed options for the reserves.

SFQ:

- How much will this advice cost? Don't know yet but approx £200 to £400 at most.
- Will there be a limit on the maximum amount to spend? Yes - £400 during the vacation.

Opposition: Josh Bell (Oriol) was concerned this motion would lead to OUSU being landed with a big bill.

Anneliese Dodds (St Hilda's) – the whole of the budget will not be blown on this. The Sabs will be responsible.

Jason Dorsett (Oriol) – Alex will not spend too much on this. We need to establish some form of policy on our reserves as the Joint Committee of Hebdomadal Council request us to do this. If a limit is to be set it should be high – something like £1500.

MTV – carried

Council voted

For: 31

Against: 3

Abs: 3

The motion was accordingly passed

### Motion 14 – OUSU Staff

Anneliese Dodds (St Hilda's) – lots of staffing issues that mean we need to look at this issue over the vacation. The likelihood is any advice would save us money in the long run from being more efficient. There are current problems in leaving ourselves open to issues of liability.

SFQ:

- Why have we not discussed pay and conditions in Council before? Always difficult because you are dealing with exact staff salaries. Not sure if it is appropriate for Council to do this for non-accountable people.
- Efficiency savings do not mean cut backs in staff or pay cuts? No. But staff do not always know what they should be doing and some retraining may be necessary as OUSU is not the organisation it was 20 years ago.
- Does the University give advice for free? No. Who will give it? The University will do so on a payment basis. Also Brookes have a full time manager who might know some of the issues involved.

No opposition

**The motion passed nem-con**

### Motion 16 – National Blood Service

Joel Brookfield (Keble) moved a procedural motion to lay this motion upon the table because Council had had enough discussion for one day, we would go inquorate and Queer Rights needed further discussion.

Laurence Norman (Keble) opposed saying Joel's analysis was wrong and we should debate this now.

Procedural motion failed

Council then went inquorate.

**The motion was accordingly binned**

**Meeting closed 7.34pm**