

RATIFIED

The *Draft* Minutes of
THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

1st Week Trinity Term 2019

Monday 29th April 2019

TV Room, 16:00

Present

The President (Ms Genevieve Athis, *Christ Church*), **The President-Elect** (Mr Brendan McGrath, *Oriel College*), **The Librarian** (Ms Sara Dube, *St Hugh's College*), **The Librarian-Elect** (Ms Mahi Joshi, *Trinity College*), **The Treasurer** (Mr Charlie Coverman, *Brasenose College*), **The Treasurer-Elect** (Mr Shining Zhao, *University College*), **The Secretary** (Ms Amelia Harvey, *Kellogg College*), **The Chair of Consultative Committee** (Mr Elliot Bromley, *St Edmund Hall*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Spencer Cohen, *Brasenose College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Nikhil Shah, *Exeter College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms Beatrice Barr, *St Peter's College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Adam Wilkinson-Hill, *Jesus College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Kitsu Egerton, *Regent's Park College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Mo Iman, *Somerville College*), **The Returning Officer** (Mr Stanislas Lalanne, *Merton College*), **The Chair of Debate Selection Committee** (Mr Lee Chin Wee, *Trinity College*)

Attending

The Director of Digital Operations (Mr Hugh Bellamy, *Lady Margaret Hall*), **The Access Officer** (Mr Rabii Malik, *St Anne's College*), **The LGBTQIA+ Officer** (Mr Joe Sisson, *St John's College*), **The Deputy Returning Officer** (Mr Dominic Brind, *Magdalen College*), **The Deputy Returning Officer** (Mx Charlie Willis, *Wadham College*), **The Events Officer** (Mr Oliver Tushingham, *St John's College*), **The Ordinary Member** (Mr Troels Boesen, *St John's College*), **The Ordinary Member** (Mr Sultan Al-Kawari, *St Hilda's College*), **The Ordinary Member** (Mr Jed Burkat, *Brasenose College*), **The JSoc Delegate** (Ms Nicole Jacobus, *Christ Church*), **The JSoc Delegate** (Ms Nina Morris-Evans, *Lady Margaret Hall*)

Absent

The Senior Librarian (Mr Sean Power, *Oriel College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Ayman D'Souza, *Christ Church*), **The Bursar** (Ms Lindsey Warne)

Apologies

The Senior Librarian (Mr Sean Power, *Oriel College*), **The Bursar** (Ms Lindsey Warne), **The Elected Member** (Mr Ayman D'Souza, *Christ Church*)

The President opens the meeting at 16:07 in the TV Room.

The President gives the Secretary permission to record on a phone for the duration of the meeting in the TV Room.

Requests to Pass Absences from Previous Meetings

The President-Elect moves that the Standing Committee pass his absence from the TT19 0th Week Ordinary Meeting of the Standing Committee with 'good reason' due to a pressing and extraordinary engagement.

Seconded by the President.

Mr Iman moves that the Standing Committee pass the absence of Ayman D'Souza from the TT19 0th Week Ordinary Meeting of the Standing Committee with 'good reason' due to an immovable academic commitment.

Seconded by the President.

Matters Arising from Previous Minutes

Ratification of Minutes

Draft *in camera* minutes

The President moves the meeting in camera at 16:10.

The President moves the meeting ex camera at 16:12.

The President moves that the Standing Committee ratify the *in camera* minutes subject to the changes from the President and the Returning Officer.

Seconded by the Treasurer.

Draft minutes from TT19 0th Week TSC

The President states that they have a few issues with the draft minutes.

The President states that they do not believe to have moved to ratify officials who had not completed more than half of their vacation days, but the minutes say that they did.

The President lists the people in question (Priyesh, Fletcher, Maxwell, and Kamran) and that it was decided to leave it until the following week.

The President continues that the discussion surrounding the Standing delegates is not there and should be.

The President states that the Bursar was misquoted during the discussion of fines, and that the Bursar had actually said that the General Office fines were in place for committee members, rather than just 'members'.

The President continues that the OLDUT Chair 'was' a friend of Benazhir Bhutto, not 'is', as Benazir Bhutto has passed away.

The President states that Katie Hopkins must be explicitly mentioned in the minutes.

The President suggests suspending ratification until the next meeting.

The Secretary agrees.

The Returning Officer notes that there is a list of 'attending' and 'present' in the minutes and that their understanding is that 'present' includes anyone who is a member of standing who is here and that 'attending' is anyone who is not a member of standing who is here.

The Returning Officer states that both the Returning Officer and the CCC are listed as 'attending', but are both members of Standing.

The President asks what the CDSC is listed as.

The Returning Officer states they do not have the minutes in front of them.

The Secretary explains that they were told it was voting members versus non-voting members.

The Returning Officer states that it should be all members should be listed as 'attending'.

The President confirms that this is how it has been done in the past.

The Returning Officer states they will send a list after the meeting.

The President asks if there are more comments, and, seeing none, notes that the ratification will be pushed to next week.

The President

Business of the President:

Vacation Days

The President states that Kitsu completed 12 out of the 15 that were required of him and that it is up to the Standing Committee to vote whether to bring an IDC against him.

The President re-expresses their view that Kitsu is an international student who had already booked flights to Hong Kong.

The President continues that the remote days were scheduled towards the end of the vacation, where there was not much work left to do, so they did not manage to make it to 15 days.

The President-Elect states that it is not actually whether we want to IDC Kitsu, then asks for the exact wording.

The President states that the rule they wrote says that the Standing Committee get to vote on whether or not it was due to 'good reason'.

The President-Elect disagrees and asks the President to get the rule out.

The President states that they think it is true, but will get the rule out.

The President asks the Returning Officer if it is now in the new rules.

The Returning Officer replies that they are.

The President reads out "Should the elected member fail to meet their vacation day requirement, the Returning Officer should summon an Intermediate Disciplinary Committee... Standing Committee may waive the subclause for an individual elected committee member if they determine by 2/3 majority at the Ordinary Meeting of 1st Week that the failure of the member to complete their vacation requirement was due to extraordinary circumstances", which they believe is what they said.

The President-Elect asks if the rule says 'unforeseen'.

The President says that it says 'extraordinary circumstances'.

Mr Iman states that they do not think a flight can constitute 'extraordinary'.

The President states that this can be discussed and that there will be a vote and if there is not a 2/3 majority, then they will bring an IDC.

The President-Elect does not think Kitsu should have an IDC brought against them, however there is also not an extraordinary reason not to, concluding that they think it is a really silly rule.

The President states they do not think it is a silly rule because, unlike previous terms where all of Standing Committee had failed to meet their vacation day requirements, by reducing the number of days to 15 and having an

auto-IDC in place has made it so every member of Standing and Secretary's Committee, apart from Kitsu, who is the only member who had a flight booked, besides Spencer getting a train back to Paris, which was slightly more flexible, everyone managed to complete their vacation days.

The President continues that this is reflected in the term card, since the Standing Committee were very good and on it, so they do not think it is a silly rule.

The President believes that, in the case of Kitsu, extraordinary could be having an election and booking flights before knowing if you're going to get elected or not.

The President-Elect counters that it's not extraordinary not to realize when you are able to do remote days.

The President states that it is different from doing non-remote days that require spending 8 hours in the Oxford Union.

The President-Elect agrees that it is different, but not extremely burdensome to figure out in advance when you can do them.

The President-Elect continues that Kitsu did a fine number of days and should not be punished, but that the rule implies that they should and that he will vote to waive it.

The President agrees that Kitsu should not be punished states that this rule acts as a way to have a punishment as an option that did not exist before, unless an unforeseen circumstance comes up, and suggests that the President-Elect may want to change the reasons.

The President-Elect states that they just want to delete the rule since they think it is a bad rule, but that it will be discussed next week.

Mr Cohen states that it is a good rule, but that it should probably be changed to 'with good reason', which makes more sense.

The President agrees that changing it to 'good reason' is much better.

Mr Cohen continues that it makes the interpretation for Standing Committee much easier.

The President repeats that they like the rule and invites the President-Elect to feel free to change it.

The President asks the Returning Officer how the vote should be moved.

The Returning Officer states that it should be mentioned that the failure to complete the vacation days was due to extraordinary circumstances.

The President moves that Kitsu Egerton failed to complete his vacation days, but completed 12/15, which was due to extraordinary circumstances, and therefore the President should not bring an IDC against him.

For: 11

Against: 0

Abstention: 1

The motion passes.

The President states that it will be easy to see who voted for and against since all but one voted yes.

The President-Elect asks if how certain people voted has to be recorded.

The President states that it was decided last week that it is not required.

The President-Elect asks whether the Standing Order was changed.

The President replies that they do not believe it was properly passed.

The President-Elect is surprised.

Mr Bellamy states that it was implemented in a large 30-page document.

The President-Elect clarifies that it is up to the Secretary to include names or not.

The President confirms.

Standing Order change to C5

The President states that this is a benign change.

The President continues that current procedure excludes the Chief of Staff from handling the ballots, however the Chief of Staff will be handling all debate-related procedure.

The President states that this change will allow the Chief of Staff to execute these duties under the rules.

The President moves that the Standing Committee amend Standing Order C5(b) to insert 'the Chief of Staff,' after 'the Chair of the Consultative Committee'.

Seconded by the Treasurer.

The motion passes nem. con.

Ratification of appointed officials

The President states that they got in touch with the appointed officials in question.

The President states that there should be a provision in the rules that the President must notify any officials who had not properly completed their vacation days, as they could be vetoed without their knowledge, and that this is worth looking at in the next meeting.

The President ensures that they did in fact reach out to all of them.

The President states that Priyesh Patel has resigned from their role as Graduate Officer, and that Maxwell (Temporary Membership Officer), Fletcher (Disabilities Officer), and Kamran (Ethnic Minorities Officer) have all given reasons.

The President states that Kamran's reason was too much academic work over the vacation and that they apologize.

The President states that Fletcher's reason was due to health reasons, which have also stopped their degree and exams, which are earlier than the rest of committee since Fletcher attends Oxford Brookes.

The President states that Maxwell's reason was due to academic work and that since he is also at Oxford Brookes that the dates and timeline are different.

The President states that Kamran's reason is less reasonable than that of Maxwell, as all Oxford students have a lot of work over the vacation.

The Returning Officer asks if any of them are finalists.

The President replies that they are not, and that Kamran is a first year student.

The Returning Officer asks if they were very much aware of their exams

The President confirms and states that vacation day requirements were made clear.

The Returning Officer asks if these were unforeseeable and if any evidence was provided.

The President states that only Fletcher provided evidence of unforeseeable circumstance.

The Treasurer asks how many vacation days each completed/

The President states that Kamran completed 3, Priyesh completed 1, Maxwell completed 1.5, and Fletcher completed 2, and points out that all in question are Union liberation officers who were required to do ten days.

The President suggests they be examined as separate cases.

The President-Elect asks if the President is able to appoint new ones.

The President replies that they will do as Dan Wilkinson attempted last term.

The President-Elect asks if the President has anyone in mind.

The President replies that they do not, but that they will be conducting interviews with the Access Officer, and suggests moving to a vote.

The Returning Officer asks if the position will open up to original applicants or if it will be an entirely new process.

The President replies that the positions will be advertised again on the noticeboard and in weekly mail-out for this term as quickly as possible, given the Michaelmas applications are live in 6th/7th week.

The President asks if they must move to 'ratify' or 're-ratify'.

Mr Sisson expresses that they believe it is 're-ratify'.

The Returning Officer states it should be 'ratify'.

The President asks if they must vote in favor if they move the motion.

Mr Sisson says they do, as moving the motion does not mean voting for it.

The President moves that the Standing Committee ratify Fletcher Ransberry as Disabilities Officer.

For: 12

Against: 0

Abstention: 0

The motion passes nem. con.

The President moves that the Standing Committee ratify Kamran Ali as Ethnic Minorities Officer.

For: 4

Against: 1

Abstention: 7

The motion passes.

The President moves that the Standing Committee ratify Maxwell Quinn Stewart as Temporary Membership Officer.

For: 5

Against: 0

Abstention: 7

The motion passes.

The President states that Kamran, Fletcher, and Maxwell will remain Liberation Officers and that they will re-open applications for Graduate Officer sometime this week and conduct interview.

Controversial speakers

The President notifies the Standing Committee that Katie Hopkins will be coming again and does not foresee any other controversial speakers.

The President asks for the Standing Committee to let them know if there is any disagreement and if there are other controversial speakers who require official notification.

Press Requests

The President received one press request from the Cherwell about the goose-stepping incident.

The President gave a comment that it was completely unacceptable and that they agree with the Disciplinary Committee's decision concerning the membership suspension and the fine.

Billy Joel event

The President states that officers are supposed to give termly budgets, as was brought up during Finance Committee, under standing order A2, but this has not been done for a while.

The President continues that the rule needs to be re-written, as it requires the Librarian to produce a speaker budget and the Treasurer to produce a debate budget, especially since there are new, more reasonable budget limits.

The President states that think the President should produce a debate and speaker budget, which is currently in process with the help of the Chair of the Consultative Committee.

The President warns the Standing Committee that Billy Joel will be an expensive event, especially in production.

The President states that they do not have exact figures yet and are not sure if it will exceed the overall budget, but that the Standing Committee will be updated with projected figures, as it is difficult to get exact figures.

Change to Rule 2 proposal

The President states that Rule 2 is the objects of the society and that, even though some people don't like it, protecting and encouraging free speech is at the core of what the Society stands for.

The President finds it weird that free speech is not mentioned in the rules, alongside the current statements about education and the facilities like the bar and snooker room.

The President states there is no come back within the rules in regard to controversial speakers that past and future presidents may host.

The President continues that Rule 2 is the only in which OLDUT have power of interpretation over.

The President ensures they have received consent from the OLDUT Chair and Trustees to change this rule, subject to two changes: that ‘protect’ replace ‘uphold’, and that it is with the ‘consent of the trustees’ rather than approval.

The President states that the latter of the two is not actually written within the rules, and is thus not important.

The President ensures they have received permission from the three other trustees.

The President states that if Standing Committee passes this recommendation that it will be passed on to the Chamber on the 9th of May, which is fitting given the Free Speech debate.

The President reads the change including the amendments: “The Society shall seek to uphold and promote the freedom of speech and expression of its members and guests”, with the change from ‘uphold’ to ‘protect’.

The Returning Officer asks if this rule could become restrictive to disciplinary committees.

The President states that this matter was discussed with the Chair of OLDUT, and that the disciplinary committee would be trusted to make the distinction between hate speech and free speech.

The President continues that the disciplinary committees act as investigators and that free speech is something that is pledged in term cards.

The President-Elect suggests adding an amendment that this rule does not apply to misconduct under Rule 71.

The President states that they do not disagree with the President-Elect and Returning Officer, but that any offense committed under Rule 71 will be taken to a disciplinary committee in any case.

The President-Elect says that saying you can’t goose-step is a failure to protect freedom of expression.

The Treasurer moves to grant Joseph Sisson (LGBTQIA+ Officer) speaking rights.

Seconded by the President.

Mr Sisson states that Rule 71 has the exact same status in the rules as Rule 2, and that unless OLDUT has issued an interpretation that goose-stepping is protected by Rule 2, then it would not be able to be counted as hate speech, but as it stands a disciplinary committee can interpret how they choose, so it is not reasonable to say that goose-stepping is protected as freedom of expression.

The President-Elect asks for clarification as to why it is not reasonable.

Mr Sisson states that the disciplinary committee had an explicit discussion about whether the goose-stepping in question constituted freedom of expression.

The President states that this is in the redacted version of the report.

The Returning Officer asks if this information is *in camera*.

The President assures that it is in the public version of the report.

Mr Sisson adds that the names are redacted.

The President asks for more comments on the rule change.

The Treasurer thinks it makes a lot of sense, as the Union often quotes MacMillan and the notion of being a bastion of free speech.

The President adds that it is almost disingenuous that it isn’t in the rules, and clarifies that it is not intended to validate offensive conduct under rule 71.

The President believes that Rule 71 is enough to stand alone and cover disciplinary offenses, as it has already.

The Returning Officer asks if this rule could in anyway be binding to a President in designing a speaker list.

The President states that the wording intentionally says 'guests' as they have already been invited, but that they are open to further clarifying.

The President moves that the Standing Committee recommend to the Chamber the Private Business Motion [the changes to Rule 2 proposed by the President], approved by the trustees of OLDUT, with the friendly amendment to change 'uphold' to 'protect'.

Seconded by the Treasurer.

The motion passes nem. con.

Update on Brookes Life Membership

The President states that they went to steering committee meeting where they met with OLDUT.

The President says that the main issue with the Brookes life membership is that it could influence OLDUT and the Union's charitable status.

The President notes that this has been an ongoing issue between Presidents and OLDUT for some time now and it often seems like OLDUT are dragging their feet on the issue.

The President clarifies that OLDUT have sought pro-bono legal advice and have legal minds on their committee who have given an unofficial opinion that it is fine.

The President continues that these opinions were given informally, as they have a vested interest and do not want any risk of conflict of interest.

The President remarks that OLDUT are now seeking to hire legal help and that OLDUT have been given a deadline around mid-term so that Standing Committee may be given an update.

The President reiterates that paying for the legal advice will make the process quicker.

The Returning Officer asks if we are still waiting for legal advice.

The President says yes and continues that there was reluctance from the trustees to give formal advice given their vested interest.

The Returning Officer asks if, when in four weeks, the legal advice comes back that we will extend life membership to Brookes if possible.

The President states that the decision is ultimately up to the Standing Committee and if the Trust Deed is non-compliant with this change, then it is possible to amend the trust deed, which is a much longer process.

The President continues that as this has been going on for a while that they are keen to find a solution.

The President thus proposes an amendment to Rule 3(c) and Standing Order F7 to introduce a new type of membership.

The President explains that members can currently extend their temporary membership, not to a lifetime membership, but a permanent membership which allows them to come back for events and use of the facilities, but unable to run for office or vote in public business, but must show specific commitment.

The President states that they never understood why this was not already available or why Brookes students must show specific commitment.

The President details their proposal in which Brookes students can have permanent membership from when they begin their course at university.

The President explains that Brookes is reluctant to advertise, as their students pay more and it stops after three years, whereas with the proposed changes, they would always be able to come back for events and use the facilities.

The President clarifies that they will still not have the right to run for office, which may be granted to them in the future, but not for now.

The President elaborates that this will be better for recruitment and provides a more similar alternative to life membership.

The President-Elect states that there is ambiguity in the phrasing 'at the beginning of their course of study'.

The President asks if the President-Elect is referring to 3(C) or F7.

The President-Elect asks which we are talking about.

The President explains that both a Rule and a Standing Order have to be changed for this type of membership.

The President-Elect states they were referring to C(d)(i).

The President asks why it is unclear.

The President-Elect asks if it is that at the beginning of their course they are entitled and at the end of their course they are not.

The Returning Officer suggests changing 'at' to 'from', since 'at' may imply that.

The President agrees to take it on as a friendly amendment and asks if there are any further comments.

The President asks if the Standing Order change can be passed subject to the rules change.

The Returning Officer says that it can.

The President moves that the Standing Committee amend Standing Order F7 (c) to read 'Permanent Membership: Members of the institutions listed below shall be eligible for Permanent Membership from the beginning of their course', subject to the change of Rule 3 set to pass during the 2nd Week Public Business Meeting.

Seconded by the Treasurer.

The motion passes nem. con.

The President moves that the Standing Committee recommend to the Chamber the Private Business Motion (amendment to Rule 3 (C) (d) (i) proposed by the President) to the 2nd Week Public Business Meeting.

Seconded by the Treasurer.

The motion passes nem. con.

Update on fundraising effort for 2023

The President states they received an update on the fundraising efforts from the steering committee meeting.

The President continues that OLDUT had a fundraiser who has resigned, so OLDUT would like the Union and the Standing Committee to have more input in terms of fundraising effort, as they are currently missing will and manpower.

The President states that OLDUT have less time, whereas the Standing Committee have more.

The President states that the fundraising needs an aim, such as upkeep of the buildings, which is not very 'sexy'.

The President suggests a 'President fund', as the requirement for running for President of the ability to fund yourself for an entire year is a limiting aspect of the society.

Ms Barr states that while it is a limiting factor, the funding should be expanded to lower levels of the society as well, and recommends reaching out to ex-officers as well.

The President completely agrees, and more generally states that vacation expenses should be higher and looked at over the summer vacation.

The President continues that the Standing Committee will have the power to make a change, and that a 'Presidential stipend' is a good way of marketing it.

The President notes that they do agree that making committee more possible and affordable is important.

The President asks for ideas about working with OLDUT and asks if any committee members would be willing to work on this.

The Chair of the Consultative Committee volunteers.

Ms Barr volunteers.

Mr Shah volunteers.

Mr Cohen volunteers.

The President states that the Ex-Secretary Nick Leah is interested as well.

The President reiterates that fundraising is not going as well as hoped and that more support from the Standing Committee is needed, in addition to a clearer aim.

The President states that a lack of additional suggestions from the committee will be taken as a general endorsement of the 'presidential stipend' idea.

Update on meeting with minority groups

The President states they have been meeting with the ex- and current Presidents of Jewish Society to discuss how the Union could be more sensitive with its events and making people more aware than before.

The President cites the example of the Malaysian Prime Minister last term.

The President continues that the Jewish Society representatives had two suggestions.

The President moves to grant Nicole Jacobus speaking rights.

Seconded by Mr Cohen.

The President notes that the first suggestion is to let minority groups know of controversial speakers in advance.

The President expressed concern about having any form of pre-release regarding the term card and has reached a compromise through a Standing Order change.

The President explains that the compromise is that the President would let other society presidents know, specifically the Jewish Society, the Afro-Caribbean Society, the LGBTQ+ Society, and the Islamic Society.

The President notes that the current methods limit time available for these societies to prepare for a reaction and the goal is to give notice via email to these four societies in an attempt to create a less adversarial relationship.

The Chair of the Consultative Committee (henceforth **The CCC**) notes that the burden falls solely on the President and asks why these four groups in particular would be informed.

The President replies that they discussed a range of groups, but concluded that these four have members who are most likely to feel threatened by Union speakers.

The CCC states that it is odd to suggest that specific societies are more likely to be against events.

The CCC expresses that they are not sure this is a water-tight approach.

The CCC continues that this implies that the Union decides who will be affected and that other societies may take offense, adding that it is not right to cut others out of the dialogue without sufficient justification.

The President assures that this was raised with the Jewish Society representatives and that the President would have to reach out to the main societies to ask if this is something they would like to participate in.

The President notes that societies can always reach out in future terms and that other societies will also make the effort.

Ms Barr notes that the four suggested societies tend to take the most public objections to speakers, adding that the Jewish Society and the LGBTQ+ Society have issued public condemnations, so there is precedent from these societies.

The Treasurer informs the Standing Committee that the Standing Order change has just been circulated.

The President asks the Standing Committee to check their emails for the change.

Mr Cohen notes that if the concern is not about offending and avoiding bad press, then this should not be limited to four societies.

Mr Cohen continues that if there is concern regarding a reaction, it is best to focus on the people who will be offended rather than singling out societies and focusing on institutionalized conflict.

Mr Cohen states that they agree with the CCC's statements.

The President agrees and points out that there is no viable way to reach out to every single person in Oxford.

The President states that this is a pragmatic solution that will reach a large number of people.

The President continues that the term card is public and it is possible to flag these events.

The CCC notes that Ms Barr said that some societies tend to speak out, but that those who tend to stay silent must also be considered.

The CCC questions whether this is borne out of the Union being proactive or not, and remarks that this seems responsive to the past.

The CCC points out that this places a large burden on the President due to the amount of opinion and subjectivity involved.

The CCC asks which societies would have been contacted for the Steve Bannon event.

The President replies that probably every one of them would have been contacted.

The CCC asks if Nigel Farage would be treated the same, if every event would face some sort of justification, and if this would be better done before the Standing Committee.

The CCC points out that lots of speakers come to the Union and could say anything, and that there would have to be response from the Union after an event.

The Treasurer-Elect agrees with Mr Cohen and the CCC in that this should not be limited to four societies solely because they are likely to be more reactive.

The Treasurer-Elect proposes that the President inform the four societies and that the Standing Committee vote on other societies to inform.

The President states this is a good idea.

Ms Barr, in response to Mr Cohen, states that these societies exist to represent their members, noting that there is no way to reach out individually, but that the Union should reach out, especially considering the free speech amendment.

Ms Barr continues that there is no reason not to reach out and try to cooperate with them.

The President-Elect addresses the burden on the president, noting that the change says that the President 'may', thus imposing no burden on the President and doing nothing to actually address the legitimate concerns of societies.

The President replies that those concerns have to be mitigated in some way, but that they do not want to impose too much of a burden on the President.

The President clarifies that the Standing Order is meant to begin a culture change wherein the President makes a genuine effort to reach out to societies.

The President continues that this should not be done through binding the President, but rather encouraging them to do so.

The President believes this will begin as a tradition, and as the society works off precedent this will become a grey area where people do not absolutely have to do it.

The CCC points out that one president may choose to do so, the next president may not, but understands the goal of encouraging a culture change.

The CCC continues that there is technically no burden, so if they choose not to, then they must deal with the burden of the society, which is still a burden placed on the President.

The President clarifies that this attempts to place some burden on future presidents without opening them up to disciplinary action.

The President notes that this has been discussed every term, but no solution has been found.

The President-Elect states that any society representative would say that this change is toothless.

The President asks that a copy of the change be shown to the Jewish Society representatives.

Mr Sisson says that this is the first specific reference point for the President, and that it is a step in the right direction regardless of powers and burden.

Mr Sisson continues that protecting the President should be stringent, with no undue obligations as the President is not necessarily fully informed as to who could be reactionary.

The President gives the example of Yvonne Ridley, and that the President at the time did not realize that it would cause offense to the Jewish community, thus they would not wish to bind the President.

The President continues that this draws attention to something that should be thought about and is radical in the context of the Union.

The President points out that this is a suggestion from the Jewish Society representatives, but that it has to protect the President.

Ms Jacobus states they think the change is fine the way it is, as it is meant to encourage a culture change.

Ms Jacobus continues that if a President did not want to inform a Society that it says more about the President, which would provoke a stronger response in other societies.

The President states that this would put on pressure rather than create an offense, noting that people don't generally want to look bad.

The President-Elect asks if it looks bad to wait until after publication of the term card, as it would be less than useless.

The President disagrees, saying that the point is so it does not have to happen before the term card is published, but that it should be made more obvious well after, again without imposing a burden.

The Returning Officer agrees with the premise of a culture change, but equally agrees that the Standing Order is toothless.

The Returning Officer suggests replacing 'may' with 'it shall be recommended'.

The President states they are happy to take that suggestion as a friendly amendment.

The CCC questions what falls within the remit of the Union – if Brookes societies would be included, if the influence spreads wider, would the entirety of the western world be informed, where is the line drawn?

Ms Jacobus states that they were hoping to give context from a society perspective.

Ms Jacobus continues that societies like the Jewish Society want to be aware of the speakers so they can reassure members about welfare, make a statement, organise specific security for protests, and that this would exist so that societies who represent Union/Society members can proceed as they would like.

The CCC points out that the University and the Union are explicitly separate, noting that the Union is not a club or society of the University of Oxford.

Mr Iman points out that Ms Jacobus stated that the societies act as welfare, and notes that if Union members are concerned then they have the option of attending Access Committee for welfare.

The Treasurer states that this change is a recognition that the Union has a responsibility as a bigger player on the wider Oxford stage, and that members may be more comfortable seeking welfare elsewhere.

Mr Iman points out that the Union is not in place to assist non-members of the Union.

The Treasurer states that this is recognition of the fact that we do collaborate with other societies, such as the Polish Society.

The Treasurer continues that this recognizes some form of responsibility and is a low burden in order to begin a culture shift.

The Access Officer states that the committee must agree whether or not there is a responsibility in the first place.

The Access Officer continues that there is a clear responsibility for image and perception, noting that they appreciate the CCC's points, and that the suggested system sounds perfectly fine.

The Access Officer adds that they can imagine how Pakistan Society would react and that they would enjoy being reached out to, through they are not the most likely to be affected.

The Access Officer points out that it must be determined how much responsibility is on who and that rewording is a good start towards a culture shift rather than toothlessness.

The President states that the Access Officer's comments are helpful.

The Librarian states that it is fine that the change is not binding, as it is meant to be a change in culture rather than a mandate.

The Librarian agrees with the Returning Officer's proposed amendment.

Mr Cohen agrees with the Librarian.

Mr Cohen continues that the change would create a burden, whether binding or not.

Mr Cohen suggests that an extraordinary meeting of the Access Committee could be called in order to think about everyone that could be affected and to make recommendations to the President.

Mr Cohen notes that this is a mandate of the Access Committee that is institutionalized.

The President states that the change is not a bad thing in its current form, but that it is a bad thing for the President to be expected to know exactly who would and wouldn't cause offense.

The President believes this is a good thing to bring to Access Committee, however they do not wish to place undue burden as everything could be considered a grey area.

The Access Officer states that is useful to assign to Access Committee, as the President could not say they had no idea.

The Access Officer continues that this would create a need to justify on the record.

The Librarian-Elect agrees that there should be a provision like this and that it should not bind the President or any of the committees.

The President states that it could be possible to set precedent for the Access Committee to discuss the Term Card without putting it in the rules.

The Librarian-Elect notes that it is not necessarily wise to have the meeting after the term card release rather than before.

The President states they would object to having this type of meeting before the release, as not all societies can be trusted with the information and it is important to maintain control over it.

The President notes that the society has a duty to protect its speakers as well.

The President continues that this Standing Order could be more specific in terms of term card release and time frame.

The President also points out that this makes it easier for other societies since they would not have to go through the whole Term Card.

The Treasurer requests that the Standing Committee put a pin in this discussion in order to cover DSC expenses, as they must leave shortly.

The Treasurer informs the Standing Committee that due to the absence of the Bursar and lack of Senior Treasurer, that DSC expenses will have to be postponed to next week's meeting.

The Treasurer leaves the room at 17:20.

The Returning Officer asks if this meeting would take place around the release of the term card or not.

Mr Sisson suggests 48 hours after the Term Card.

The President-Elect points out that the Term Card is published and there is an accompanying Cherwell article.

The President-Elect believes that an email would seem like tokenism.

The President replies that there could be more people who are offensive and others who may slip under the radar, but that it would be insulting if it were Steve Bannon.

Ms Jacobus states that, as Jewish Society President, that it would not be insulting at all, but rather appear that the Union is making an effort to reach out and support the other societies' members.

The CCC does not believe it should occur before the Term Card release, noting that if there is a potential issue then all the pressure piles on the Union and stating that this is a dangerous precedent to set in terms of committee burden.

The President replies that heads of these societies accept the commitment of inviting controversial, potentially offensive speakers, and would like a head's up for the purpose of preparations.

The President continues that there is an understanding that these types of people will be invited, but want a warning.

The President adds that the change to Rule 2 is a sign that the Union does not want to compromise its values, but will accommodate.

The CCC understands they would like acknowledgement, but the Union sending an email about the term card seems like a bizarre form of outreach.

The President replies that the email would be worded in a way that draws attention to speakers rather than going into specifics.

The CCC notes that there is a difference between an ordinary member going through the term card and a president of a society.

The CCC notes that the presidents of societies are the best equipped to determine who would be offensive and that they have a better understanding of the needs of their members.

Ms Jacobus states that this is the first step in building a better level of trust between minority societies and the Union, and that having this come from the Union instead is an important step in showing that the Union wants to help and protect other societies' members.

The CCC states that no one on committee would do that.

The President states that the President knows the speakers inside-out and it would be much quicker for the President to identify the speakers who may cause offense to the societies, especially since it is non-binding.

The CCC points out that if a person is overlooked that societies could begin to question why they were not informed.

The President replies that if something is missed, then 'sorry, tough'.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill argues that it would have to be a list of every single speaker, even if there is no ill-intention it could still cause offense.

Mr Cohen states that it would also be the Standing Committee and Access Committee's responsibility, not solely that of the President.

The President states that there is no point in doing this if it were just a list of all the speakers.

The President continues that the point is that the President is the most aware, and that since this is non-binding, there would not be disciplinary action for accidental oversight.

The President notes that this is meant to protect the President as much as the Society, while avoiding criticism under the rules.

Mr Iman asks if this is a start, where is it going.

Ms Jacobus replies that in an ideal world there would be a notably different situation that is different from free speech and no platforming, but would rather focus on taking the first step before determining what comes next.

The Librarian-Elect asks about practical considerations for timings, such as if there were an event in 0th week or 1st week would the societies be identified.

The President notes that they would not be able to inform them in time, as this is not meant to be a pre-release of the term card.

The Librarian-Elect understands that it is symbolic, but notes that if the society wants other societies to take practical considerations into account, they are not sure whether there is sufficient time.

The President replies that this leaves more time than not telling them at all.

The President continues that the printed copy of the Term Card is not out yet, but online version has been up for a week and a half now.

The President notes that they try to inform general public 7 days before the event, and that a gesture that should be made.

Mr Sisson adds that the President is capable of knowing who should be informed.

The President notes that a president can do whatever they like to an extent, and could tell societies in advance in any case.

The President remarks that this sets precedent and acts as encouragement.

Ms Jacobus states that they appreciate the wording, and that the fundamental reason for communication is because members feel vulnerable when the Union does nothing in light of speaker opinions.

Ms Jacobus continues that being able to say that the Union is aware and has reached out is reassuring.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill notes the event with Nick Offerman that occurred in 0th week of Hilary term and asks if it were someone offensive, how would that be handled.

The President replies that this event was still advertised online and on Facebook.

The President continues that once you an event is advertised to everyone then you go to societies.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill points out that the idea is to inform with enough advance warning.

The President notes that 0th week is always difficult, but that it would be better to make more time in advance.

The Returning Officer suggests changing 'term card' to 'relevant speaker events'.

The President accepts this change and summarizes that they have changed 'may' to 'it is recommended' 'publication of term card' to 'publication of speaker event', and added 'within 48 hours'.

Mr Iman moves for a secret ballot concerning Standing Order C10.

The motion fails.

The President moves that the Standing Committee amend Standing Order C10, as proposed by the President, including the friendly amendments: replace 'may' with 'it is recommended', replace 'publication of term card' with 'publication of relevant speaker events', and add 'within 48 hours'.

For: 11

Against: 1

Abstention: 0

The motion passes.

Introduction of Standing Order for flagging events

The President states that the second thing suggested by the Jewish Society was to add trigger warning-esque additions to event descriptions in order to flag certain events to students.

The President states that they do not agree with this suggestion, as it is important to maintain professional, good relationships with speakers and that trigger warnings might be of offense to speakers.

The President continues that if you are going, then you are likely to know about the speaker, and can always stand up and leave, but that they are happy to bring this to discussion.

Ms Jacobus elaborates that this functions as a follow up from the first point, as a much more public way of showing knowledge of speaker controversy.

Ms Jacobus continues that this would show that the union is aware and is making an effort to make minority members feel that the Union is looking out for them a bit more.

Ms Jacobus suggests that this could take the form of an additional sentence at the end of descriptions depicting what the person is known for or their publicly held beliefs.

Ms Jacobus states that this could be applied to different situations and grey areas, such as debate with Naz Shah, by adding a more detailed type of description, specifically added as a final sentence and implying that these views may come up.

The President counters that there is a possibility to challenge the speaker, and that they want people to feel comfortable enough to challenge the speaker.

The President continues that in past terms there has not been sufficient challenging, which is why there has been the introduction of interview training, which demonstrates that the Union has put more effort in, as well as a financial investment.

The President adds that it would have been easier to defend the Bannon event had there been interview training.

The President states that Ms Jacobus told them they think that the beginning of the event is too late.

Mr Cohen says that they have personally experienced speakers refusing to come because of a blurb that was too offensive.

Mr Cohen continues that when people are publicly called anti-Semitic, for example, that they will not come back, causing other speakers to decline due to a past speakers' opinion.

Mr Cohen stresses that this would damage the ability to attract world class speakers due to the assumption that press would be bad.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill states that the Union is a place of free speech, and it is not a right for someone to come and spout horrific, bigoted things.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill supports the idea that opinions should be contested and that the Union should continue to welcome members to challenge these people and their views.

The President agrees, and thinks that that is why the President has a remit of challenging those views on the floor in the chamber first.

The President adds that they appreciate the disagreement over the question of whether it should be addressed before or after event.

The President maintains that free speech ideals must be upheld, adding that no speakers have been deified and that all were challenged.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill adds that it is easy for the president to find speakers who have controversial views, and that it is hard to ensure otherwise.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill adds that they do not want to impose undue burden, but questions the harm in letting students know that there is something that might be discriminatory.

The President replies that the world is information centered and that if you're interested in an event, then you probably know if the person is controversial.

The President continues that there is a level of individual responsibility, which can become clear within a 2 minute Google search.

The CCC asks at what point does the individual take responsibility and where one draws the line to trigger warnings or similar additions.

The CCC suggests that this would become the Union placing people into a box and might offend people who do not consider themselves forewarned.

Ms Jacobus replies that in most cases this would be obvious, and that most people won't do the google search, and that hopefully most cases will be brought up when this is very public knowledge.

Ms Jacobus continues that this would demonstrate protection and safety of minority members who want to go to an event they may feel unsafe about.

Ms Jacobus stresses that this is about welcoming minority members.

The President points out that if the audience were to boo, there are points of order and that if a speaker incites violence or a member gets booed, there is a bell to be rung.

The President assures that they understand the concern.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill states that picking members at random is difficult, and notes that there was an uncomfortable reaction in the room with the Prime Minister of Malaysia.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill notes that it's more difficult to judge if you aren't a part of that minority.

The President counters that denying the holocaust cannot be interpreted differently, and thinks that the interviews should be done properly.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill asks if there is a reason not to implement these flags.

The President asks if this would in turn determine who is invited.

Mr Wilkinson-Hill replies that if this is about repairing relationships, then it should be considered.

Mr Cohen states that they worked the PM event, and that there were questions that challenged the Prime Minister's views.

Mr Cohen notes that the room was populated by a lot of South Asian students and people who agreed with the speaker, and that many people were upset by the event.

Mr Cohen adds that there should be a sense of personal responsibility among the president or the interviewer, but adds that there is a difference between being challenged and being unwelcomed.

Mr Cohen states that the interview could have been told to be more challenging than it was, but also that it could have been a more hostile audience.

Mr Cohen says the Union could have used more communication.

Ms Barr states that they also worked the event and that the Ex-President did challenge the speaker, and that the problem was that it wasn't sufficient, but that those Societies' who felt differently probably wouldn't pay much attention to the response of the society after the fact.

Ms Barr adds that there is no point if the Society's response gets ignored.

Ms Barr states that there doesn't necessarily need to be a trigger warning or stringent rules for blurbs and Facebook events.

The President clarifies that they meant societies saying 'not to have a speaker'.

The President gives an example of the Manny Pacquiao event, where minority students informed them of details of the situation, which they drew upon during the interview in order to challenge.

The President assures that they wouldn't just ignore a response, and that they do not want this to limit hosting speakers, but rather want to encourage challenging.

Mr Sisson states that if an event is mislabelled, and is then exposed to thousands of people, legal action may be taken for libel.

Mr Sisson adds that the event would become about the speakers' past rather than conversation and legitimacy.

Mr Sisson elaborates that it is entirely possible to miss comments, and the Union could face backlash if something is overlooked, which can lead to more problems with the wider community.

The President wants to echo what Mr Sisson said, adding that some people came to see Manny Pacquiao as a boxer and some came for political reasons.

The President states that the event didn't become about homophobia, it became about other things.

The Returning Officer mentions that they must leave, but that Mr Sisson will handle his business.

The Returning Officer reminds the President that DRO nominations will need to be opened.

The President confirms with Mr Sisson that they have everything they need.

The President states that they personally disagree with the principal of flagging Union events and thus didn't put anything together.

The President asks for final comments, and seeing none, concludes their business, adding that they have noted DRO nominations must be opened.

Questions to the President:

There are no questions to the President.

The Librarian

Business of the Librarian:

The Librarian has no business.

Questions to the Librarian:

There are no questions to the Librarian.

The Treasurer

Business of the Treasurer:

DSC expenses (see earlier in minutes)

The President reminds the committee that this has been pushed to next week.

Questions to the Treasurer:

There are no questions to the Treasurer in their absence.

The Secretary

Business of the Secretary:

The Secretary has no business.

Questions to the Secretary:

There are no questions to the Secretary.

Mr Spencer Cohen

Business of Mr Cohen:

Mr Cohen has no business.

Questions to Mr Cohen:

There are no questions to Mr Cohen.

Mr Ayman D'Souza

Business of Mr D'Souza:

Mr D'Souza has no business.

Questions to Mr D'Souza:

There are no questions to Mr D'Souza.

Mr Nikhil Shah

Business of Mr Shah:

Mr Shah has no business.

Questions to Mr Shah:

There are no questions to Mr Shah.

Ms Beatrice Barr

Business of Ms Barr:

Ms Barr has no business.

Questions to Ms Barr:

There are no questions to Ms Barr.

Mr Adam Wilkinson-Hill

Business of Mr Wilkinson-Hill:

Mr Wilkinson-Hill has no business.

Questions to Mr Wilkinson-Hill:

There are no questions to Mr Wilkinson-Hill.

Mr Kitsu Egerton

Business of Mr Egerton:

Mr Egerton has no business.

Questions to Mr Egerton:

There are no questions to Mr Egerton.

Mr Mohamed Iman

Business of Mr Iman:

Mr Iman has no business.

Questions to Mr Iman:

There are no questions to Mr Iman.

The President-Elect

Business of the President-Elect:

The President-Elect has no business.

Questions to the President-Elect:

There are no questions to the President-Elect.

The Librarian-Elect

Business of the Librarian-Elect:

The Librarian-Elect has no business.

Questions to the Librarian-Elect:

There are no questions to the Librarian-Elect.

The Treasurer-Elect

Business of the Treasurer-Elect:

The Treasurer-Elect has no business.

Questions to the Treasurer-Elect:

There are no questions to the Treasurer-Elect.

The Ex-Officers

Business of the Ex-Officers:

The Ex-Officers have no business.

Questions to the Ex-Officers:

There are no questions to the Ex-Officers.

The Senior Librarian

Business of the Senior Librarian:

The Senior Librarian has no business in their absence.

Questions to the Senior Librarian:

There are no questions to the Senior Librarian in their absence.

The Senior Treasurer

There is no Senior Treasurer.

The Bursar

Business of the Bursar:

The Bursar has no business in their absence.

Questions to the Bursar:

There are no questions to the Bursar in their absence.

The Returning Officer

Business of the Returning Officer:

Interpretation repeal

Mr Sisson draws the committee's attention to the documents provided by the Returning Officer concerning interpretation repeals.

Mr Sisson states that since most of these are uncontroversial and that all parties concerned have had the chance to read them, they will take any questions or comments on the immediate interpretation repeal.

The President notes that they have five points.

Mr Sisson reminds the committee that the entirety of section A is up to the discretion of the Returning Officer.

The President states that they have objections to A27, A65, A126, A125, and B2 all for the same reason.

The President continues that the repeal of these interpretations depend upon the rule change that still needs to be passed in the Chamber.

Mr Sisson clarifies that these are all conditional to that rule being passed.

The President says that these are fine in that case.

Mr Sisson asks for any other comments.

Mr Bellamy asks how many pages have been gone through in the rules.

Mr Sisson replies that the Returning Officer is making good progress.

Mr Sisson states that all will go through with the repeals.

The President states that they still have an objection to B2, but will discuss this with the Returning Officer.

Rules change

Mr Sisson states that the Returning Officer wishes to make changes to Rule 34, Rule 35, Rule 36, Rule 54, and Rule 71, as stated in the appendix.

Mr Sisson asks for comments.

The President replies that they were all fine.

Mr Sisson asks if there are any requests to make changes.

The President states that the changes are sensible and quite benign.

Mr Sisson notes that the current Returning Officer is notoriously benign.

Mr Sisson requests that a member of committee move to recommend.

The President moves that the Standing Committee recommend to the Chamber the Private Business Motion (amendments to Rule 34, Rule 35, Rule 36, Rule 54, and Rule 71 proposed by the Returning Officer) during the Public Business Meeting on the 9th May 2019.

Seconded by the Mr Iman.

The motion passes nem. con.

Mr Sisson explains the change to Standing Order D6, and that the current process for counting votes is determined by Standing Order.

Mr Sisson continues that this is an interpretation so that the elections may actually run.

Mr Iman asks if Mr Sisson would like someone to move this.

Mr Sisson says yes.

Mr Iman moves that the Standing Committee amend Standing Order D6, as proposed by the Returning Officer.

Seconded by the President.

The motion passes nem. con.

Mr Sisson discusses the fourth of the Returning Officer's motion, which is a substantive change concerning transparency concerning the work of committee members and their manifesto pledges.

The President asks Mr Sisson to confirm that this is non-binding.

Mr Sisson confirms that this is non-binding.

Mr Sisson explains that Ordinary Public Business Meeting (henceforth 'OPBM') reports are the current way by which committee members inform the members of their work.

Mr Sisson continues that these went up on noticeboard and have been read by roughly nine people.

The President states that they thought there were more.

Mr Sisson replies that there may have been.

The President estimates twenty.

Mr Sisson states that these reports don't do what they set out to do.

Mr Sisson notes that last term's reports were published on the app, but that the Returning Officer wants the distribution to be wider, potentially included on the website and mailing list, or completed earlier in term.

The Librarian notes that there are some claims in the OPBM that would otherwise be unable to be claimed as they are un-scrutinized, and asks how this would be treated.

Mr Sisson replies that there is a specific offense about lying in an OPBM report.

The Librarian asks about specific wordings used, such as 'organised'.

Mr Sisson replies that there is a reasonable way to adapt the scrutiny process in light of OPBM reports, in light of the fact that interpretation of those words changes each term.

Mr Sisson continues that using the OPBM reports to lie or manipulate an election would be a very serious offense and be grounds for an election tribunal if a direct lie is found.

The President notes that ordinary members can and do read these reports, and thus agrees that it is a huge issue.

Mr Sisson says that if the purpose of an OPBM report becomes to get votes, then that is a direct breach of Rule 33 (A) (i).

The Librarian asks what would happen if someone claims to have 'organised' a debate in their OPBM report, but that in scrutiny it gets taken down to 'arranged'.

Mr Sisson replies that in that type of instance it could be deemed reasonable if the person thought they had grounds for an 'organised' claim, but that it would be unreasonable if the person hardly put any work into it.

The President notes that ordinary members don't necessarily have specific knowledge of the definitions of 'organised' or 'arranged', but rather understand that there has been some level of contribution.

Mr Sisson notes a second point, in relation to the recent changes to Rule 71, which requires all committee members to make a reasonable effort toward their pledges.

Mr Sisson continues that the Returning Officer intends to make this more transparent by requiring committee members to include all the progress made on their pledges on their manifestos in their OPBM reports.

Mr Sisson adds that if a committee member has made no progress toward their pledges then they would be opened up to disciplinary offense.

Mr Sisson states that the intention of this is to increase transparency.

The President states that this second point is incredibly fair and holds elected members accountable.

The President notes that there may not be the appetite for OPBM reports on the website or the mailing list.

The President does not think that people don't read the OPBM reports because they are only on the noticeboard, but rather that they do not understand what OPBM means.

The President continues that they are not sure if this is due to the Union not being transparent about it or if it is because people generally become members for other reasons, such as events or socials, adding that members may not make the connection that committee is responsible for these.

The President is not sure that there will be sufficient interest for it, and fears it may clutter the information that the committee is trying to get across with the weekly mailout.

Mr Sisson replies that members who would read everything in emails are those who would be interested in what is said.

Mr Sisson adds that while it may not reach everyone, this would increase transparency and that in the context of pledges, you can reference every pledge you've made plus the efforts after.

The President asks for clarification on an aspect of Rule 71, regarding the ease of claiming having 'championed' when it was only mentioned by someone once in a meeting.

The President asks if this would mean that if a certain pledge is mentioned, but there was no action taken, would that count as progress under the current rule.

Mr Sisson replies that this would be up to the Returning Officer's discretion.

The President asks the committee for their comments and concerns, as this will directly affect them in the future.

Mr Sisson clarifies that promises made before this rule goes into effect would likely not be taken into account for disciplinary offense.

Mr Bellamy asks why it should be a disciplinary offense not to do something.

Mr Sisson replies that it is not their rules change.

Mr Bellamy states that surely the failure to do anything should be highlighted on election material.

Mr Sisson adds that a suggestion was made to put a disclaimer at the top of manifestos, but that they think this would be grossly unfair and would put lots of burden on the candidate and finding guilt.

The President points out that it is similar to a proper campaign, and that politicians don't have a warning about what they did not do.

The President-Elect asks about names, and how the rule states it has to be one of your first names.

Mr Sisson replies that this was a combination of two interpretations.

Mr Sisson continues that if a candidate does not provide a reasonable name – reasonable being something you are commonly known by, then the Returning Officer must use a first name or surname.

The President states that they were initially confused as well, but that it means, for instance, if the President-Elect were to run under the name 'Amelia', the Returning Officer would be able to dispute it, and change the name to

‘Brendan McGrath’.

The President-Elect states that the Rule initially looked as though the Returning Officer has absolute discretion.

Mr Sisson clarifies that if the name is confusing, frivolous, or not a recognized name, then the Returning Officer has the right to use an official first name and/or surname.

Mr Sisson states that this is what occurs anyway.

Mr Sisson and the President-Elect converse at the same time as the President and Mr Iman.

The President-Elect asks if there has been an instance where a candidate has used only one of their first names.

Mr Sisson replies that it would be possible to use a first initial for instance, but that one would need to at least use a surname.

The President-Elect asks what would happen if someone wanted to shorten their name.

Mr Sisson replies that it is fine as long as it is a name they are recognized by.

Mr Bellamy asks if the President-Elect’s name is not Brendan.

Mr Sisson says that the President-Elect could run under ‘B. McGrath’.

--

Mr Iman asks for instance if they would be fine to use ‘Mo’ instead of ‘Mohamed’.

The President replies yes, as that is not confusing or misleading.

The President gives the example of ‘Noorie’, who is always referred to as a nickname.

The President continues that it stops people from being explicitly misleading, citing the example that they could not for instance run under the name ‘Nick Brown’, but that ‘Vieve’ would be fine.

--

The divided discussion is brought back to one discussion.

Mr Iman moves that the Standing Committee express agreement in principle that greater transparency to Members concerning the work of Committee members, and efforts made to fulfil manifesto pledges, would be welcome.

Seconded by Mr Shah.

The motion passes nem. con.

The President adds that the Returning Officer will bring something to the committee in the coming weeks.

Questions to the Returning Officer:

There are no questions to the Returning Officer.

The Chair of the Consultative Committee

Business of the Chair of the Consultative Committee:

The Chair of the Consultative Committee has no business.

Questions to the Chair of the Consultative Committee:

There are no questions to the Chair of the Consultative Committee.

The Access Officers

Business of the Access Officers:

The Access Officers have no business.

Questions to the Access Officers:

There are no questions to the Access Officers.

The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee

Proposed increases to DSC Spending in TT19

The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee (henceforth ‘The CDSC’) states that in the absence of the Bursar and the lack of Senior Treasurer, they propose the committee have a quick chat.

The CDSC continues that they will move to have an expenditure increase due to a revenue increase, due to additional revenue from Oxford Schools and smarter spending practices in Hilary Term.

The CDSC notes that the provided documents contain the justification and the proposed increase for the next three terms.

The President moves to grant Dominic Brind (DRO) speaking rights.

Seconded by Mr Wilkinson-Hill.

The President states that they understand that some of the schools weren’t paid for the first week, but they were entitled to it and that they weren’t notified, and asks if more money could be asked for in the future.

Mr Brind states that the way the current system works is that there are two options in place: one standard and one access.

Mr Brind continues that on the application, if you think you will be unable to pay for this, you tick a box plus provide a written justification of about 100 words.

Mr Brind adds that they have about 1000 pounds available, which turned out to be about the same for those who applied to bursary.

Mr Brind suggests that there could be funding from the Union for outreach to schools concerning the availability of the bursary.

The President understands that the DSC is expanding and doing better and better, and that they don’t want to raise the budget pre-emptively where there is a situation where there is less money to spend but a larger budget.

The CDSC clarifies that they only take into account the amount of profit available, and that they try on a regular basis to break even, and since this year has made a good profit, they thought it was a good time to change it.

The President notes that this cannot be fully discussed yet and encourages everyone to read the change if they have not yet.

The President adds that discussion will continue once the Bursar is here.

Questions to the Chair of the Debate Selection Committee:

There are no questions to the Chair of the Debate Selection Committee.

Changes to the Composition of this Committee

There are no changes to the composition of this committee.

Any Other Business

There is not any other business.

Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be Monday 6 May at 4:00pm in the TV Room.

The President closes the meeting at 18:22.

Signed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Amelia Harvey', with a stylized, cursive script.

Amelia Harvey

Kellogg College

Secretary