

Council Minutes

7th week Trinity term 2012

7th Week Council to held at 5.30pm on Wednesday 6th June 2012, at Queen's College.

If you have any questions about OUSU Council, you should feel free to contact the Chair, Charlie Baker at any time on chair@ousu.org

- a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
- b. Matters Arising from the Minutes
- c. Ratifications in Council
- d. Elections in Council
- e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers
- f. Reports from the Executive Officers who wish to make reports
- g. Questions to Members of the Executive
- h. Emergency Motions
- i. Passage of Motions Nem Con
- j. Motions of No Confidence or Censure
- k. Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders
- l. The Budget or Amended Budget
- m. Motions Authorising Capital Expenditure
- n. Other Motions
 - i. motions affecting ousu members as ousu members
 - ii. motions affecting ousu members as students at Oxford University
 - iii. motions affecting ousu members as members of the student movement
 - iv. motions affecting ousu members as residents of Oxford
 - v. motions affecting ousu members as residents of the United Kingdom
 - vi. motions affecting ousu members as citizens of the world
- o. Any Other Business

Procedural Motion

Jim O'Connell (Univ)

Proposing to have ordinary before termly so that we can read the election regulations in 7th week an termly. Felt important to have consultation so people can submit thoughts, in order to avoid nitty gritty drafting in council. Important to pass or have a debate in order to pass before Mt13 currently a mess and have caused into question the fact that we are running free fair elections. Think we need to at least give them a chance of passing twice this council. Need to switch 2 round to have effective debate. Did in MT and checked with legal trustee that this is acceptable. Think need a set of new election regulations so pass this motion so that we can debate.

SFQ

Adam Tyndall (Hertford)

How would you respond to claim that it defeats the point of termly council?

Jim O'Connell (Univ)

Think we've had a lot of consultation two sets of electoral review, clear direction of travel towards making them clearer. Think enough democratic legitimacy to do this.

Martha Mackenzie (St John's)

Precedence for this in previous years.

Opposition

Jack Matthews (Univ)

Before I start on substance, have to make very clear, excellent way team doing this have gone about doing this. Clear that this is the best consultation that has ever been done. Opposition is no reflection on excellent work they've done. I have been able to participate whilst being 2500 miles away. Why I oppose is because council cannot do what doing now. Rules that termly council has to come before ordinary council, don't believe multiple times have been done. Think just one which I have done. When I moved termly council at end of MT11 what I did was wrong. Used extraordinary council to pass, no precedence except where I did it and I say it was wrong. What we've decided upon in our rules, so should adhere to. To make an analogy if were a cake the cake that has been made is best cake ever had in ousu, are going in right direction, to pass them now is to deny the wholesome whipped cream and jam of debate. Each time I read through I spot something I had done. next time looked at will be after next elections. Can do properly in MT and then in HT. If look back at one's that have been passed in tt have never been done right.

I realise I am in a minority, some things more important than council, that is the rule.

Alex Lans (St Catherine's)

After looking at 1000s of pages nothing perfect, keeping the current one's which don't actually promote democracy. We can debate the rules but the bottom line is we need to do what is best for the democratic nature of OUSU. I would like Jack to stand his ideological importance down in favour of democracy.

Martha Mackenzie (St John's)

This has been done before, standing orders can set timetable of council, internal affairs, and chair are happy. It is doable it is democratic. This is their 8th draft, have been drafted by a government legal expert, they are good they are not perfect, but they will be so much better than the standing orders.

James Raynor (Worcester)

We have to ask why sitting here, we are representing the students, have to decide whether value democracy or fairer elections. These are good and for the sake of a rule, which won't promote democracy, we shouldn't hold up.

Move to vote

Passes by majority.

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

No problems with the minutes.

d. Elections in Council

Elections for the following positions were held in OUSU Council of 7th week.

2 positions on Scrutiny Committee - Scrutinises the work of the OUSU Executive and the Divisional Board Representatives. How the power to call officers to be interviewed and request documents. Issues a report each term to OUSU Council. To serve until the end of Michaelmas Term 2012.

Jack Matthew University College was elected

1 position for Deputy Returning Officer - assists the Returning Officer in running elections. Serves until end of Hilary Term.

No one Elected

No request for husts. Please vote and someone will collect.

i. Passage of Motions Nem Con

i. motions affecting OUSU members as OUSU members

ii. motions affecting OUSU members as student at Oxford University

1. Postgraduate Fee increases

Council Notes:

1. This term, the Divisions with the exception of Medical Sciences are supporting a postgraduate fee uplift for 2013-2014 that exceeds inflation.
2. Despite lobbying by OUSU officers the University appears set to allow this to go ahead.
3. The College Fee may also go up by a similar amount.
4. As with every year, some departments are proposing to additionally increase the cost of individual courses.
5. That the dominant motivations behind the way Divisions and the University have thought about fee increases are expressed in terms of 'what the market will bear' and 'benchmarking against our competitors'.
6. MCR Prescom passed a motion opposing fee increases with no academic justification, and supports OUSU Officers in writing to Divisional Heads to communicate this stance.

Council believes:

1. That graduate education comes at a cost that has to be met.
2. Graduate education is not a product to be sold and graduate students should not be treated like consumers. Rather, graduate students should be treated as partners in academic endeavour and as 'the engine room of the University' (to quote the Vice Chancellor).
3. Where possible, the University should look to attract funding for graduate students so the fees costs can be met whilst attracting and retaining the best students.
4. The University should continue to prioritise fundraising for graduate support and should make good on its promises in this area as expressed in the most recent strategic plan.
5. In proposing fee levels, the University and Divisions must prioritise academic considerations over financial ones.
6. At present, the University and Divisions are not doing this.
7. It would be helpful in order to make sure the University and Divisions properly take account of academic considerations if graduate fees were subject to a measure of consultation and negotiation, in the same way Colleges make sure that their rent levels are not damaging to the academic lives of the student body.

OUSU Council resolves to:

1. Mandate the OUSU VP (Graduates) to write to the Heads of Division (except for Medical Sciences) and the Pro Vice Chancellor (Planning and Resource Allocation) proposing a mechanism for fuller student consultation on fee levels for future years.

Proposed: *Jim O'Connell (Univ)*

Seconded: *Martha Mackenzie (St John's)*

Passes

2. Retention of the Tutorial System

Opposition

k. Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders

OUSU Election Regulations

Council Notes:

1. OUSU made its new Bye-Laws on 9th May 2012.
2. As required by Bye-Law 3.4, OUSU must, at some point, provide Election Regulations to cover its election procedure.
3. Section C (elections) of the current Standing Orders is very confusing.
4. A set of Draft Election Regulations are attached to this motion.
5. There has been an open consultation on these Regulations
6. These Regulations will require additional documents to be produced over the long vacation.
7. The Trustees have been consulted on the attached Draft.
8. The University must give their final approval to the attached Draft before they are adopted.

Council Believes:

1. OUSU should be able to govern itself properly and professionally.
2. Running free and fair elections is very important.
3. Making elections accessible to all is very important.
4. Having a functioning set of Election Regulations is therefore very important.

Council Resolves:

1. To insert Election Regulation
17.4 No candidate or slate may seek or claim the support or endorsement of OUSU or any OUSU committee
2. In the exercise of its powers under Bye-Law 4.14, to appoint 6th June 2012 as the date on which the following Bye-Laws take effect: Bye-Laws 5.1 to 5.3, 8.1 to 8.4, 9.1, 9.2, 18.1 and 18.2.
3. In the exercise of its powers under Bye-Laws 3.3 and 3.4, to make the Election Regulations presented for its approval on 6th June 2012.
4. To request the Internal Affairs Committee to draw up a plan for the repeal of redundant Rules and Standing Orders under Bye-Law 2.3(b) and (c).
5. To bring for ratification in Michaelmas Term 2012 the first "Nominations Pack" produced for under these regulations for the Michaelmas 2012 elections.

Proposer: *Martha Mackenzie (St John's)*

Seconder: *Jim O'Connell (Univ)*

Martha Mackenzie (St John's)

These are the actual election regulations, consulted across 4th 5th and 6th week, on whole take on spirit of standing orders but these clarify. They have changed in substantive way; couple of things aren't in here. Don't have to go to specific print shop, no restrictions on engaging with media. Take on spirit of past electoral reviews, hope have debate, but on whole think that they are much clearer, it's about making them open and accessible. Hopefully everyone will know what's going on. Happy to answer questions.

Jack Matthews (Univ)

What happens to senior tribunal?

Martha Mackenzie (St John's)

Senior Tribunal won't change substantively but will be room for continuing consultation with the University.

Jim O'Connell (Univ)

Spoke to Senior Proctor, explained 1994 Education Act. Under old standing order, complain to RO, could then appeal to JT, if JT felt that something really bad had happened could refer to senior tribunal who would then disqualify. Because independent charity can't tell University what to do, they then have to come up with own statutes to govern this.

Opposition

These new regulations are awesome, only oppose for 3 reasons, think something needs to go back in, Lets start straight away amending. Some big changes that weren't raised in consultation. No opposition apart from one have made an amendment.

Old one stopped final year students running, no longer in. No more print shots. Can now campaign for RON and one thing brought amendment on, a student or candidate or slate could claim support of OUSU or one of it's campaign. Will explain later. In summary think awesome and then debate.

Amendment 1

Not being taken as friendly. JM Council resolves

Jack Matthews (Univ)

The reason want to bring back is whilst I recognise guiding principle of making more liberal think this will guard against the elections becoming insular. OUSU and its campaign are associated with someone on exec, and most of these are on elections committee. Think this will cause a conflict of interest, think it would look bad to have candidates going round saying endorsed by OUSU or autonomous campaign, don't think will prevent freedom of engagement or people doing new things, need to ensure that this student unions elections are free and fair and seen to be free and fair.

Olvier Gleeson (Christ Church)

Was this in standing orders before and why cut out?

Jack Matthews (Univ)

Was in and went through set of rules that went to University.

Jim O'Connell (Univ)

I think that if someone passed a motion, to endorse Jack Matthews. I don't think council will endorse a candidate. Reason took out; every third word of standing order is 'no', which meant candidates afraid of campaigning. The starting point, is why ban something we have really tried not to ban things, a candidate for VP women gets endorsed by WomCam think useful thing for OUSU to know about. Same thing applies don't think by and large will endorse. Very strong safeguards to prevent people on elections committee standing.

Adam Tyndall (Hertford)

My concern with this amendment is similar body, fine for stuff that OUSU governs can't endorse because of the similar body.

Jack Matthews (Univ)

Would you support if took in parts?

Sarah Santhosham (Corpus Christi)

What scares me about this is that we have these campaigns, is that we have these campaigns they are autonomous, they should be able to politicise.

Martha Mackenzie (St John's)

We don't govern they are autonomies, strict rules on endorsement. Sat on electoral review. Trust democracy trust electorate. If something bought a motion to council to endorse we wouldn't.

Sean Robinson (The Queen's)

Sfq don't understand campaigns etc. An OUSU committee that isn't autonomous.

Jim O'Connell (Univ)

One of the next phases is to answer this question, we are updating governing documents. We have liberation campaigns, which are autonomous.

Seb Baird (Corpus Christi)

General principal is that given resources but aren't governed by staff or OUSU exec.

Daniel Stone

Committees are guided by OUSU council, things decided by Council on them binding.

Sean Robinson (The Queen's)

Having had that clarified think really bad if OUSU committee endorsed candidates. Think would be really bad, makes committees in OUSU unhealthy politicised don't think that something mandated by OUSU council should be able to mandate something. Think that people not involved in OUSU should be able to stand and those who have been involved.

Jess Pumphrey (Magdalen)

LGBTQ campaign very small and could be mobbed out, so people could get an endorsement which looks official but is actually seedy. Will distract campaigns from work during election period.

Helen Robb (St Anne's)

Don't think any benefit to saying being endorsed by campaign. Prevents WomCam from having to get politicised. Maintains openness of elections, allows people to put case across on equal platform.

Sarah Santhosham (Corpus Christi)

Share Jess's concern, autonomous campaigns there to give minority groups a strong voice, does mean they don't have official membership, so people could hack a meeting they speak on behalf of people wrong of these groups. Have been working on mature students and signed in, would give me disproportionate amount of power.

Basil Vincent (Keble)

On basic level no one can approach committee members in JCR think dangerous to say have endorsement of campaign, don't want people to think things already decided would make OUSU more open.

Alex Lans (St Catherine's)

People are allowed to make decisions that they want. I see this as us as controlling electoral process, we are saying not intelligent enough so have to create a safeguard, Should trust their own judgement.

Oscar Lee (New)

Should consider autonomous campaigns, if one wins the endorsement, other could be at disadvantage, could become infiltrated by hacks rather than on their own merits.

Sarah Santhosham (Corpus Christi)

People coming in and infiltrating won't work, being passionate about campaign will help. Empowers campaign and engage with OUSU structure, if more than one person then will have to say how much have done. Will work really well for campaigns in Oxford.

Tom Rutland (Jesus)

I would like to pass this amendment, think principle is about opening up elections, don't want to shut down, and want to ensure that the elections are open.

Speech in opposition**Jack Matthews (Univ)**

Think there are many examples in past where someone running from inside and outside campaign, person running outside won, wonder if would still happen if this doesn't pass. Think this preserves it, shouldn't make negative. Some examples that still negative, still prohibit use of mailing list, shouldn't let everyone gains better from not allowing them to be used. This will preserve the openness of the elections, and the openness of the campaigns. Think we should ensure elections remain open. It is just a preservation of what occurs.

Jim O'Connell (Univ)

Think hear arguments, reason why important to have few no's as possible, want to reduce complaints. If someone claimed have worked with Campaign, need to trust students and campaigns, shouldn't trample on their autonomy. Lets try saying yes, for so long we have said no in our rules.

Adopting first part. Passes

2nd part

They are not really autonomous, use name of OUSU need to protect this name. Hacks could use this rule to bring down some person that worked with this campaign. This is just a preservation of this rule. Please support.

Opposition

Adam Tyndall (Hertford)

Was erring on side of supporting campaigns, these are political campaigns, they are political and should be autonomous, should be able to support if we wanted. The ambiguity is what they trade on.

Jack Matthews (Univ)

Similar body in old one worked would quite like to have full stop.

Jim O'Connell (Univ)

Old standing orders didn't work this is why we are here.

The amendment reads. up until committee.

2nd amendment taken as friendly.

Chris Gray (Merton)

Provision in election regulations elections committee have to provide a nomination pack, to help make open motion. This just states that the first one will come to council for it to be looked at.

Adam Tyndall (Hertford)

The election regulations take away ambiguities and petty fines. Suggests that democracy and choosing free and fair elections aren't what we want. Suggest you should reject for hackery sake. Would like Jim and Martha to talk about why no time limits on complaints, would save up all complaints until first day of real campaigning so would ensure that one person from team attacking had to defend these complaints. Perhaps answer, otherwise path.

Jim O'Connell (Univ)

Old one's had 48 hours reason got rid of, campaigning period only 2 weeks, have now reduced scope of complaints now only about 9 offences, his method probably wouldn't pay off. Having said that the great thing about electoral regulations good scope for making free and fair. Also RO can ensure if frivolous then can dismiss.

Amended Election regulations.

Martha Mackenzie (St John's)

Really good so much better than standing orders please vote for them.

Jack Matthews (Univ)

Really good elections next term great would like to pass, but am making point that these are big big changes, if don't like final years can run, and that no print shop.

Motion passes.

d. Elections in Council

The following positions will be elected in OUSU Council of 7th week. To nominate for any of these positions please e-mail a completed nominations form to motions@ousu.org as soon as possible, as the deadline for nominations is midday on Tuesday 5th June. Nominations form can be found at <http://www.ousu.org/democracy/ousu-council/Election%20Application%20Form.doc/view>

2 positions on Scrutiny Committee - Scrutinises the work of the OUSU Executive and the Divisional Board Representatives. How the power to call officers to be interviewed and request documents. Issues a report each term to OUSU Council. To serve until the end of Michaelmas Term 2012. For more information contact scrutiny@ousu.org.

1 position for Deputy Returning Officer - assists the Returning Officer in running elections. Serves until end of Hilary Term. For more information contact president@ousu.org.

Nominations should be submitted by **12 noon, Tuesday of 7th week** to motions@ousu.org. A nomination form can be found at www.ousu.org/democracy/ousu-council. If you have any questions, feel free to contact the Returning Officer at ro@ousu.org.

k. Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders

OUSU Election Regulations

Council Notes:

9. OUSU made its new Bye-Laws on 9th May 2012.
10. As required by Bye-Law 3.4, OUSU must, at some point, provide Election Regulations to cover its election procedure.
11. Section C (elections) of the current Standing Orders is very confusing.
12. A set of Draft Election Regulations are attached to this motion.
13. There has been an open consultation on these Regulations
14. These Regulations will require additional documents to be produced over the long vacation.
15. The Trustees have been consulted on the attached Draft.
16. The University must give their final approval to the attached Draft before they are adopted.

Council Believes:

5. OUSU should be able to govern itself properly and professionally.
6. Running free and fair elections is very important.
7. Making elections accessible to all is very important.
8. Having a functioning set of Election Regulations is therefore very important.

Council Resolves:

6. In the exercise of its powers under Bye-Law 4.14, to appoint 6th June 2012 as the date on which the following Bye-Laws take effect: Bye-Laws 5.1 to 5.3, 8.1 to 8.4, 9.1, 9.2, 18.1 and 18.2.
7. In the exercise of its powers under Bye-Laws 3.3 and 3.4, to make the Election Regulations presented for its approval on 6th June 2012.
8. To request the Internal Affairs Committee to draw up a plan for the repeal of redundant Rules and Standing Orders under Bye-Law 2.3(b) and (c).

Proposer: *Martha Mackenzie (St John's)*

Seconder: *Jim O'Connell (Univ)*

n. Other Motions

i. motions affecting OUSU members as OUSU members

ii. motions affecting OUSU members as student at Oxford University

2. Postgraduate Fee increases

Passed Nem Con

3. Retention of the Tutorial System

Council notes:

1. Ousu's policy relating to the Retention of the Tutorial system is due to lapse
2. This policy is important for the preservation of the teaching excellence at Oxford and is in the interests of all students

Council believes:

1. Any changes to teaching methods should be carefully assessed and the student learning experience carefully monitored when such changes take place.
2. That it is the UJCC (Undergraduate Joint Consultative Committee), supported by the Vice President (Access and Academic Affairs) who should oppose changes in teaching, with which the undergraduates in their faculty are unhappy
3. The tutorial should remain the main method of teaching at Oxford.
4. The University is currently updating its Strategic Plan and support for the tutorial system should be reiterated
5. The Tutorial System is key to the academic experience of students at Oxford and should be central to any academic strategy.

Council resolves to:

1. To confirm the mandate of the Vice President (Access and Academic Affairs) to work with UJCC's
2. To encourage UJCC chairs to get in touch with the VP (Access and Academic Affairs) for information and support when changes are implemented
3. To mandate the Vice President (Access and Academic Affairs) to lobby and work with the university in creating a more comprehensive standardised system of feedback and assessment of the academic experience of undergraduates, so that any decline/improvement which comes about as a result of the changes in the teaching method can be monitored.
4. To support the retention of tutorials as the main method of teaching at Oxford

Proposed: *Hannah Cusworth (Brasenose)*

Seconded: *Martha Mackenzie (St John's)*

Hannah Cusworth (Brasenose)

This is a motion brought back from lapsed policy, focuses on retention of tutorial system.

Tom Rutland (Jesus)

Council resolves 2.1 should there be no apostrophe?

Hannah Cusworth (Brasenose)

Just a typo.

Sarah Hutchinson (St Cross)

How do you feel that this fits with the undergraduate teaching review?

Hannah Cusworth (Brasenose)

Did wax lyrical about how important tutorials are, university has taken out of context, think these have been done by people that want to take in a particular way. But actually student quite clear about it.

Sarah Hutchinson (St Cross)

There is a massive gender gap in Oxford, massive gender gap at finals, don't have statistics on how works, but tute system commonly cited as why there is this gap, and why women feel being left out. Should represent everyone and that women are being failed quite a lot by this system. Not every subject has a finals gap, think should recognise this gaps.

Adam Tyndall (Hertford)

Retention doesn't preclude reform.

Move to vote

Hannah Cusworth (Brasenose)

Think finals gap should be taken seriously, shouldn't deny isn't significant, perhaps need nuancing. Alumni feel most important, think should have mixed provision, have had policy before and think would be great to nuance.

Sarah Hutchinson (St Cross)

Only reiterate what said before, tute system just entrenches the gender gap.

Motion passes.