7th Week Council:
Minutes:

Will DORSEY – D-O-R-S-E-Y. Iain Simpson wishes to register his stupidity for the minutes.

Ben Spooner: I said that staff members were on voting lists, not that they voted.

Passage nem con:
All appointments and PGA policies ratified except:
Graduate Support for Hildas MCR
Part-Time Grad exec reforms
Violent campaigning groups.

Oliver Russell: This notes what PGA believes as graduates. Graduates believe they should have the right to select a women’s only college. We also support St. Hildas MCR with their policy. This does not undermine Charlynne’s mandate to support St Hildas JCR in what they want to do.

Benny Spooner: Isn’t the real point of ratification to see that Council agrees with it?

Chris Allan: Does this become OUSU Policy?

Dan Simpson: Yes.

James Lamming: I believe that this policy is pre-emptive, MCR don’t have policy.

?: Yes they do, 81% voted in referendum.

Ellie Cumbo: I believe that as 91% of professors are men. We should support this.

?: This is about Hilda’s MCR, a very different body, taking a stance and us supporting.

24-7-8 passes.

Part-time Graduate Exec reforms:

Oliver Russell: These are PGA’s views on part-time exec reform. They are broadly supportive of reform, but feel that these tweaks should be made. I will then go and talk to Alan and we can bring a standing order motion next term.

Some questions.
Benny Spooner: This policy doesn’t do very much, the real thing was to tell us and we’ve been told.

Aidan: This puts it in the record for the future.

MTV

No opposition.

Passes.

Violent campaigning groups in Oxford:

Oliver Russell: This is saying what we as graduate students believe about our research conditions. Makes no explicit reference to vivisection, a clause about it was taken out. We support the University’s current approach, we condemn the use of violence, and we support any student based groups in exercising their rights of freedom of peaceful expression and protest.

Hannah: From my point of view the activities of Pro-Test were antagonistic and inflammatory. I don’t oppose peaceful Pro-Test.

Miya: There’s no judgement here, the point of this is that we don’t want to alienate any student organisation providing what they do is peaceful. We support a lot of other campaigns.

Hervé: This is a very sensitive motion, in my judgement it should have been introduced in Council, this was done using a loophole in the rules. We should reject this on a matter of principles, no matter what the Pro-Test.

Emma: This leaves it too open, should have the debate about whether we want to support Pro-Test.

MTV

MTV fails

Semi-autonomous bodies should be able to pass what they want, we should attack those bodies.

Niklas-Albein Svenson: Resolves 3 says we support their democratic right to freedom of expression, rather than their actions. We want people to express their opinions but don’t want them to hit people.

David Green: All we’re doing in resolves 3 is resolving to support the peaceful expression used by Pro-Test and SPEAK. Protests do polarise opinion, there’s nothing wrong with saying we support groups exercising their right to freedom to of expression.

?: The right to peaceful protest is something very special that we should support. Perhaps OUSU should form policy on vivisection, and have a nuanced position.
Ellie Cumbo: This is a graduate issue, when you talk about graduate students you talk about people who want to go into academia, the majority of our graduates are science students. Some people might regard Pro-Test as inflammatory, but that’s no reason to stop them exercising the right that they have.

Navid, Wadham: This is about supporting any student based group which wants to have peaceful demonstrations. We should pass policy saying we support the right of groups, not that we will offer material support.

Oliver Russell: We already have measures to deal with nasty groups. But I believe we do want to support any student based group to exercise their democratic right, because students have the right and we should support them in exercising that right. There are groups we don’t agree with on a massive scale, but we have policy and measures to stop that. We already passed policy saying groups must be within the remits of OUSU Policy. We might change that later.

David Blakeham, Pembroke: The very ambiguity in resolves 3 means this could create problems.

Oliver Russell: The President can interpret that.

Chris Allan: We’ve supported lots of people, we’re saying yes, we support students in exercising their right. I don’t think this is ambiguous.

Jennifer Hoogewerth-McCombe, Merton: OUSU does support peaceful freedom of speech, so does the university. This is merely expressing support for that.

Herve Hansen: Resolves 1 would involve condemning the 1968 student protest in France.

Emma Norris: No way we can know how this gets interpreted in future. This would open the door to lots of people.

MTV

No opposition

Oliver Russell: Support student based groups does not mean logistical support. Logistical support is governed by them not contradicting OUSU Policy. All policy needs to be interpreted. We always have ambiguity, interpretation is done by President, ratified by Council. This sets the parameters for whom we support in terms of exercising their rights to freedom of expression, and parameters of those for whom we are willing to provide logistical support to.

Navid, Wadham: Potential future ambiguities. You can say you have a right to do something without providing material support to the act.

18-25-3 Not ratified.

Emma Norris: Currently subject to appalling pay – up to 11 unpaid hours each week. On 11th of March they are taking a one-day strike – not marking examinations etc. In the long run it is good for students and staff alike if the staff are well paid. This will attract the best.

Nicholas Bell: 80% of balloted or members in favour?

EN: Balloted.

Herve Hansen: When was the ballot?

EN: I was contacted a few weeks ago.

NB: What percentage of the members voted? Tiny?

EN: No – very large.

Dan Simpson: Any opposition?

NONE

Nicholas Bell: I know Dame Fiona. It is very important that we have JCC – an incredibly important forum to present our views. We need an explanation as to why it was cancelled?

Dan Simpson: Any opposition?

Ellie Cumbo: This is not diplomatic. We’ve already decided in exec that this is unacceptable. It is unproductive to write this down, it doesn’t need to be in our policy book.

Ollie Russel: Procedural motion to withdraw the motion. The proposers aren’t here, no need.

Herve Hanson:

Procedural motion fails.

Friendly amendment to withdraw “Dame Fiona’s unilateral action” and replace with “the”.

Accepted.

Aidan: This is undiplomatic, there’s no point.

Hannah: Iain didn’t contact us – this could have been resolved in a less antagonistic way.

Iain: With the friendly amendment this just reflects our views about JCC which are wholly reasonable. I phoned Emma who didn’t ask me to withdraw the amendment.

Nicholas Bell: Having heard the context I support the views of the sabbatical officers.

Hannah Stoddart: MTV

No opposition.

Iain Simpson: With amendment all it says is our views on JCC.
Emma Norris: Instead of saying that the university have behaved badly, which would put us in a bad light with the university, we could resolve this differently. Fails unanimously, even Iain doesn’t vote for it.

KEEN office space:
Iain Simpson: this also came up in exec. Oliver Russel: This is not an emergency; move to overturn the chair’s ruling that this is an emergency. Helen Bagshaw: A speech in proposition?
Oliver Russell: This is not an emergency. Dan Simpson: This occurred since last Thursday, therefore is an emergency.
Vote – chair not overturned.
Dan Simpson: back in debate.
Oliver Russel: I support KEEN and that we should support them, but I do not support “Believes 2”. University supports clubs through clubs and society’s committee. They don’t have lots of empty space to give to any group with a sabbatical officer. Nicholas Bell: What if OUCA got a sabbatical officer? Should the university give everyone space? Clubs should be able to fund their own space.
Aidan Randall: I don’t think it’s true that the university doesn’t have lots of space. It is the duty of clubs and communities to support clubs and socs.
Hannah Stodart: I agree uni doesn’t have an obligation to every club and society, but KEEN have established themselves in Littlegate House. Now the university has taken away their funding and left them on their own, they’ll be driven out of existence. For the university to kick out a society that is doing a lot of good is totally unacceptable.
Oliver Russell: I think a distinction should be made between C&S committee and the university. It is running a huge deficit, and though it would like to fund KEEN it can’t afford to. It is not a department with lots of space. Taking up the battle with another committee will not be helpful.
Helen Bagshaw: What are the chances that the university could take away part of the OUSU buildings?
Emma Norris: They’d have to consult us first.
Amendment: Strike Council believes

MTV
Hannah
Oliver Russell: The university has no responsibility to KEEN, asking them for help is silly.
Motion passes.

Amended Budget:
Chris Allan explains budget.
Amended budget passes nem con.

Environment Handbook:
Hannah Stoddard: Sustainable living should only be encouraged. This won’t create any extra burden. Jenny Hoogewerth-McCombe: Surely printing vast amounts of literature isn’t carbon friendly.
Hannah: Benefits of this would outweigh carbon costs.
Chris Allan: Is this meant to replace the ethical Oxford guide?
Hannah: Due to funding shortages, probably not won’t have ethical Oxford guide.
Amendment to strike all references to survival guide.
Accepted as friendly.
Passes.