

Draft Minutes of  
THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE  
2nd Week Michaelmas Term 2018  
Monday 15th October 2018  
President's Office, 16:00

**Present:**

**The President** (Mr Stephen Horvath, *New College*), **The Librarian** (Ms Genevieve Athis, *Christ Church*), **The Treasurer** (Mr James Lamming, *Exeter College*), **The Secretary** (Mr Nick Brown, *Magdalen College*), **The President-Elect** (Mr Daniel Wilkinson, *Oriel College*), **The Librarian-Elect** (Mr Brendan McGrath, *Oriel College*), **The Treasurer-Elect** (Ms Amy Gregg, *Magdalen College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms Rebecca Collins, *Balliol College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms Sara Dube, *St Hugh's College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms Gemma Timmons, *Magdalen College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Harry Webster, *Worcester College*), **The Elected Member** (Ms Mahi Joshi, *Trinity College*), **The Elected Member** (Mr Maxim Parr-Reid, *Trinity College*), **The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee** (Mr Andrew Seow, *Lincoln College*), **The Access Officer** (Ms. Kirsten Stewart, *Trinity College*), **The Chair of the Consultative Committee** (Mr Patrick Cole, *Lady Margaret Hall*)

**Attending:**

**The Bursar** (Ms Lindsay Warne), **The Senior Treasurer** (Mr Stephen Dixon, *Downing College, Cambridge*), Mr. Liam Frahm, *Jesus College*, Mr. Joseph Sisson, *St John's College*, Ms. Louise Kandler, *Lady Margaret Hall*, Mr. Dominic Brind, *Magdalen College*, Mr. Ray Williams, *Wadham College*, Mr. Adam Watson, *Hertford College*, **The Returning Officer** (Ms. Alexandra Galloway, *Magdalen College*)

**Apologies:**

**The Elected Member** (Mr Harry Webster, *Worcester College*), **The Senior Librarian** (Mr Sean Power, *Oriel College*)

**Absent:**

**The Access Officer** (Mx. Brian Wong, *Wolfson College*)

*The President opens the meeting at 16.08*

**Requests to Pass Absences from Previous Meeting**

There is no discussion on absences from the previous meeting.

**Matters Arising from Previous Minutes**

There are no matters arising from the previous minutes.

**Ratification of Minutes**

The President notes that the minutes of the 1st week meeting of TSC have not yet been produced.

The Secretary says that he was not able to obtain the recording of the meeting until Friday, so has not been able to complete the minutes.

The President says that the recording should only be a backup, and suggests that the Secretary take his own recording for minuting purposes. The President permits the Secretary to record the meeting of Standing Committee. He says that he thinks the 0th week minutes are acceptable, but would prefer that some punctuation is added.

The Secretary moves that TSC ratify the minutes of the 0th week ordinary meeting of TSC, with a friendly amendment of added punctuation

*Seconded by pres.*

*Nem. con.*

The President says that he thinks we need to move *in camera* to ratify the *in camera* minutes from the 8th week Trinity Term meeting. He says that it is not a formal requirement to move *in camera*, but that it would be desirable to move *in camera* with last term's TSC but notes that this is obviously not possible, and wishes that those who have not seen the minutes should not vote on their ratification.

The Librarian-Elect notes that this situation has arisen before and must have a solution, and suggests that we urge members of TSC who were not on TSC last term to not object to the ratification.

The Librarian-Elect moves that TSC ratify the *in camera* minutes of the 8th week Trinity term ordinary meeting of TSC

*Seconded by the President*

*Nem. con.*

### **The President**

#### **Press Requests**

The President notes that he has received three categories of press requests in the last week.

1. He says that the Oxford Student and Cherwell both asked for comment on the slates debate at the 1st week Public Business meeting, and he said "after a detailed debate with strong speeches on both sides, the motion was put to a vote and passed with a majority of the roughly 80 members present"
2. He says that he was contacted by the Oxford Mail and by Cherwell, and more recently by the Oxford Student about the upcoming visit of Alice Weidel. He said "the Oxford Union remains committed to the principles of political neutrality and free speech, and we invite a variety of political leaders from different countries and different perspectives. In recent years, those who have spoke and been questioned at the Union range from Julius Malema, leader of the radically leftist Economic Freedom Fighters in South Africa, to Marine Le Pen. Alice Weidel is the leader of the largest opposition party in the German parliament, and after Dr. Weidel's speech in the debating chamber members will be able to ask her questions and challenge their views if they wish."
3. He says that he received a request from the Oxford Student about the Jon Stewart and Dave Chapelle event because he had asked them to write an exclusive article about the event. He gave comment about how excited the Union is about the event.

*Ms. Laalithya Vadlamani enters at 16.14*

### **The Librarian**

The Librarian moves that TSC ratify the appointment of Tyron Surmon as a Junior member of the Library Committee

*Seconded by the Treasurer*

*Nem. con.*

## **The Treasurer**

The Treasurer moves that TSC authorise £374.87 of DSC expenses, as recommended by TFC

*Nem. con.*

## **The Secretary**

The Secretary says that the previously authorised ball budget had an expected contribution of £1.64. He says that since the budget was passed, 180 guest tickets have been sold and 0 were accounted for in the budget, meaning that the expected contribution is now larger, and he would like to authorise expenditure both for a photographer that was removed to balance the initial budget, and for additional courtyard lighting to cover for the broken courtyard street lamp.

The Secretary moves that TSC authorise £425 of additional expenditure for the ball, as recommended by TFC

*Seconded by the President*

*Nem. con.*

The Librarian-Elect says that the proposed Private Business Motion is marked under the Secretary's business because it is unclear whether the Librarian-Elect should have business on the agenda as normal, but that he is going to ask TSC to recommend the motion.

The Librarian-Elect says that the general principle behind the proposed rules change is to make nomination for the Society's elections easier, to make it less likely that nominations will be ruled invalid because of a mistake. He says it does this in three ways. Firstly, it requires the nomination form to be laid out in a more intuitive way. Secondly, it means that the RO has to look through the minute book and means that a nomination will not be ruled invalid on the basis that a candidate has not completed sufficient nominating speeches if they have completed sufficient speeches but that these are incorrectly labelled on the nomination form. Thirdly, it means that where a nomination would currently be ruled invalid on the basis of a lack of nomination fee, contact detail or membership card photocopy, the RO now has to give the candidate an opportunity to remedy that situation. Finally, he says that where a candidate has failed to include a manifesto in their nomination, it opens a window during which they can re-submit this.

The President says that TSC should discuss each proposed clause one by one. He draws attention to the change to 34(b)(iv)(1).

The Librarian-Elect says he thinks the current form layout, with typed positions to circle, is quite obscure.

The President asks how many people have been invalidly nominated due to failing to circle the correct position.

The Librarian-Elect says that he does not know of a situation but that in such a circumstance it is left to the discretion of the RO, and mentions a case of a candidate for Standing Committee in MT2017 who failed to circle the correct section, but was correctly nominated due to the discretion of the RO at the time.

The Returning Officer says that other information in the nomination pack must be used in such a situation.

The President says he thinks it would be a change from one foolproof method to another.

The Returning Officer says she has no issue with changing the formatting of a form.

The Librarian-Elect says that if it is possible to make the form easier to fill out, he sees no reason not to do that.

The President says he is not sure it would be any easier.

The Treasurer-Elect says she thinks the Librarian-Elect's proposal would make the form clearer.

The President draws attention to the second proposed clause.

The Librarian-Elect says this makes it clear that the speeches listed on the form aren't the only ones that the RO will consider.

The Returning Officer asks how far the Librarian-Elect would expect an RO to take their investigation into nominating speeches, and asks whether the RO is expected to go through every single potential speech they may have made since the beginning of their membership if they record no speeches.

*Ms. Gemma Timmons and the CCC leave the room at 16.25*

The Librarian-Elect agrees that it is easier for the RO if speeches are recorded, and says that the RO is at liberty to put on the nomination form whatever they wish to encourage candidates to correctly record speeches.

The Returning Officer says that no Returning Officer that she is aware of has failed to contact a candidate if there has been an issue with a listed nominating speech. She says the list is not currently meant to be an exhaustive list,.

*The CCC enters the room at 16.27*

The Librarian-Elect says that the proposed rule has to conduct an additional investigation, but that it does not provide for what that will be and that the RO has discretion over this. He says that, for example, the RO could say that they will check nominating speeches back to 2016.

The Bursar says that the RO has a lot to do in a short period of time, and that if someone is nominating for a position in the management of the Union it shouldn't be beyond expectations for them to correctly fill out nominating speeches.

The Treasurer-Elect suggests a compromise whereby a candidate must list speeches, but if any of these are found to be invalid the RO might be obligated to contact the candidate to ask for evidence of additional speeches.

*The CCC leaves at 16.28*

The Librarian-Elect says this is exactly the sort of thing that could form the RO's investigation as specified in this rule.

The Treasurer-Elect asks whether rules should set up clear expectations of candidates and the RO so that both know what is expected of them.

The Treasurer asks what the Librarian-Elect means by "shall not be limited to" in the proposed rule change, and what he wants the RO to do in the nomination process.

The Librarian-Elect says that he is leaving this to the RO's discretion, but that he imagines it may be similar to solutions proposed already.

The President says that opportunities for the RO to exercise discretion should be limited, to protect the RO from accusations of innocent interference.

The Librarian-Elect says that that discretion already exists, and that under the current system the RO is entitled to conduct whatever investigation they wish after checking speeches on the nomination form.

The Treasurer says that whilst currently, going beyond checking speeches on the form is supererogatory, it now becomes required, but that what specifically is required is not specified.

The Treasurer-Elect says that she doesn't see why specifying that a candidate must continue to suggest alternative potential speeches for the RO to check until they either exhaust opportunities or are nominated isn't a good solution.

The Librarian-Elect says that he thinks this is a reasonable way to conduct the investigation, but that he would not seek to bind the RO to this strategy, and that if, for example, a candidate is unresponsive then this would not be effective.

The Treasurer-Elect says that if a candidate is unresponsive, only so much can be done to help them.

The Librarian-Elect asks the Returning Officer whether she thinks it is better to bind the RO's hands to one method, or leave them with discretion.

The Returning Officer says that she doesn't see what else could reasonably be done, other than the investigations already proposed, by a Returning Officer.

The President says that committee should consider the next clause of the Private Business Motion, to change rule 34(b)(v).

The Librarian-Elect says that the new section under 34(b)(v)(9) is modelled after the current circumstances for if a candidate forgets a photograph, but applies to a contact detail, nomination fee or photocopy of membership card.

The Treasurer says he thinks that this system can be gamed, and that it allows for a candidate to nominate without a fee, see who else has nominated for a given position and choose to either pay the fee or withdraw the nomination.

The Librarian-Elect says that he thinks this might be possible, but that this is a narrow scenario that should be weighed against the benefits to accessibility of allowing people to nominate if they screw up the process.

The Treasurer says that compared to a person who is stupid enough to not include the money that is specifically required, it is a very dangerous loophole.

Ms. Vadlamani asks who this measure is intended to increase access for, if it is an access measure.

The Librarian-Elect says it is not aimed at one particular community, but is intended to make it easier to be a candidate.

The Returning Officer says that she is concerned this could be misused and that people could make a decision on what to nominate for after close of nominations based on the candidate list.

The Librarian-Elect says that if the intended position is left off, the candidate must be nominated based on only information available in the nomination pack.

The Bursar asks the Returning Officer how many people have been disqualified because of failed nomination packs.

The Returning Officer says that she recalls one failed nomination in six terms due to a lack of nomination fee.

The President moves that TSC grant Louise Kandler, DRO, speaking rights

*Nem. con.*

The Bursar says that she thinks this means it is not a serious problem.

The Secretary says that just because it has not been a large issue in the past does not mean that it should be fixed when a solution is presented.

The Treasurer says that if it is not a significant issue, and that it has a loophole, then on balance it is a bad idea.

The Secretary says he does not think it is a significant loophole and how much use of it would be seen in practise.

The Librarian-Elect says that if this happens every once in a while, it is worth the gain that can be accrued from the change.

The Chair of Consultative Committee says that if a friendly amendment were possible to remove this loophole, it should be presented.

The Librarian-Elect says he would welcome such a suggested amendment.

The Bursar suggests that a shorter time window than that suggested in the rule change might allow for easier nominations whilst removing the loophole that has been pointed out.

Ms. Vadlamani says that if one applies for a job and fails to attach a requested cover letter, then they are rejected from that job, and do not get another chance to send one.

The President moves on to the next clause of the rules change regarding manifestos.

The Treasurer-Elect says that the time window should be minimised to ensure that people should not be able to game the system and submit information after knowledge about other candidates can be known.

The Returning Officer says that unscrutinised manifestos don't have to be posted until Saturday of sixth week, so the window could be extended.

The President says that he thinks meeting deadlines that may be tight or confusing is a relevant skill for members of Union committee.

Mr. Parr-Reid says, in general about the change, that if a candidate for University fails to submit information by the deadline, then they are not accepted and it seems odd to allow further information to be submitted after the deadline.

The President says that he thinks the final clauses of the motion are very reasonable and logical consequences of the rest of the change. He asks whether the Librarian-Elect wants to make any amendments before the motion is moved for recommendation by the committee.

The Librarian-Elect says he thinks that narrowing the window in the change under rule 34(b)(v)(9) is a sufficient amendment.

The Librarian suggests that the Librarian-Elect delay his change, make amendments and bring it again next week.

The Librarian-Elect says that he is happy to amend the motion, but not to delay the motion to a subsequent week.

The President suggests moving on to other items of business, and that the Librarian-Elect can bring an amended form of the motion for recommendation at the end of the meeting.

The Returning Officer says that one useful amendment would be to require the list of candidates to be posted between 8 and 9pm, which would make everything else required by the change possible before that time.

### **President-Elect**

### **Membership Drive Report**

The President-Elect asks the Bursar to distribute the Membership Drive figures to those members of TSC who were not present at TFC. He explains that discussion occurred in TFC regarding potential policy for the remainder of the open period, and that he is looking to expand Facebook advertising of events and the term card. He says an email on the OUSU mailing list went out at 16.03 today, and that flyers have been printed and are being distributed to all colleges.

The Treasurer-Elect says that every elected member of TSC has two colleges to pidge, and that these should be pided today.

### **Discussion of Access Survey**

The President points out that at Access Committee on Friday, discussions were had about distributing a survey on access issue, and suggests that the President-Elect consult the minutes and the committee.

The President-Elect accepts this and asks what medium the committee is planning to use to distribute the survey.

The Bursar says that previous surveys have used SurveyMonkey.

The President-Elect asks whether SurveyMonkey must be paid for.

The Bursar says that surveys can be used to generate a number of free responses, but that above that number these must be paid for.

The President suggests that the President-Elect speaks to the Access Officers, develop the survey and then bring it to Standing Committee.

The Treasurer-Elect asks whether the suggested questions will contain personal information.

The President-Elect says he was planning on asking general things about the Union and not personal characteristics.

The Bursar suggests that there could be a potential prize like a bar voucher randomly allocated to someone who fills in the survey to incentivise more people to fill it in.

The President-Elect asks what questions have been asked in the past.

The Bursar says that she has existing copies and can send them to the President-Elect.

### **Proposed Change to Standing Order C1**

The President-Elect says the intent of this change is to clarify what the President can and can't do when inviting guests to presidential dinners. He says he thinks it is appropriate that the President can decide which members of committee can bring their own guests, but that the President should not be able to veto a guest chosen by a member of committee following that choice. He says that this should not apply in cases where the chosen guest is liable to bring the Society into disrepute.



The Treasurer says that last term, a guest was invited by another member of committee and that he had to ask that guest to be uninvited arbitrarily and without giving reason because he knew the presence of that guest was liable to bring distress to other people. He says the scenario was wholly unpleasant to be in, and that he is very grateful to the ex-President Mr. Cavalcanti. He says that if this has been prohibited by Standing Order it would have made the event very awkward and distressing for many present.

The Treasurer-Elect says that as she understands it, the President has complete discretion over who can bring a guest. She says that whilst the President may, under this change, not be able to ban a particular guest, they would still be able to prevent that member of committee from bringing a guest.

The President says that whilst it would be unreasonable to do so, the President would be able to deny guest-bringing privileges after a member of committee had brought a guest the President did not like.

The Treasurer-Elect says that this may be unreasonable, but that it is allowed under the rules.

The President says that he thinks that this understanding of guests is erroneous, and that no one except the President actually brings guests to dinner. He thinks that other than guests of speakers on the paper and tellers, everyone present at the dinner is a guest of the President.

The Librarian-Elect asks whether the President thinks this would make the Standing Order change inapplicable because there is never a case where a member of committee actually brings a guest.

The President says that he does not think this, but that the way this deals with dinner guests is different to how he views presidential dinners as working.

Ms. Vadlamani says that if you look at the title of the Standing Order, it is called 'Presidential Dinners', which would suggest that everyone is the President's guest and that this should be at the total discretion of the President and there may be reasons beside bringing the Society into disrepute for wanting to bar someone from dinners.

The Bursar asks how the process of members of committee bringing their own guests works.

The President says that there is a space on the Google form for members to list their own guests, but that following this himself, the CCC and Chief of Staff will review this list.

The Bursar says that it would be the fault of a member of committee if they were to invite someone without checking with the President that this guest may be approved.

The President says that he thinks the Google form does lead to a certain understanding that members of committee are able to bring their own guests, and that the Treasurer-Elect raised an important point about the possibility of removing guest privileges following a member of committee bringing a guest they have a personal disagreement with. He says he does not think this Standing Order changes that.

The Treasurer-Elect asks the President-Elect to clarify the exact concern that this change is trying to allay.

The President-Elect says that the aim is that once the power to bring a guest has been devolved, whilst that person is still the President's guest, the President no longer has the right to dis-invite that person.

The Treasurer-Elect says that this subsequent dis-inviting could be prevented by the President presenting a blacklist at the beginning of term of people who may not be invited by members of committee.

The President says that he thinks this is reasonable, and that blacklisting but not subsequent binning of chosen guests should be allowed. He says that his understanding is that this change would ban blacklists.

The President-Elect says that it does not prevent the President from barring those who may bring the society into disrepute.

The President says that it bans blacklists based on presidential discretion, setting aside bringing the society into disrepute.

The Bursar says that it is dangerous to have a blacklist, and that it would be much better for members of committee to submit names for approval by the President before inviting them.

Mr. Parr-Reid warns of the media getting hold of such a blacklist.

The President says that rather than a blacklist it, the suggestion is just a list of people who shouldn't be invited to debate dinners.

The Bursar says this is the same as a blacklist.

The Treasurer-Elect says that there is currently a blacklist.

The Treasurer says there should be no publication of the blacklist.

The Bursar says that rather than publishing a blacklist, members of committee should be made to submit the name of their guest for approval before inviting them.

The President says that he thinks this is reasonable and that a Standing Order change to this effect could be brought next week.

The President-Elect asks the Bursar why she does not think this achieves her goal.

The Bursar says that this is just a carte blanche for people to bring the guests they want.

The President-Elect says he thought the Bursar did not want a blacklist to exist.

The President says that the Bursar means she wants the pre-submission of names to the President for approval.

The President-Elect says that he is trying to clarify the reasons for which a President is able to approve or deny a guest, and that the only sufficient reason for denying the guest is that the guest may bring the society into disrepute.

The Bursar says she thinks this is one of the privileges of being President.

The President-Elect moves that TSC amend Standing Order C1 according to his proposal

*Seconded by the Secretary*

*The motion fails, with five (The President-Elect, The Secretary, Ms. Collins, Ms. Joshi, Ms. Faruk) in favour and five (The Librarian, The Treasurer, Ms. Vadlamani, Ms. Dube, Mr. Parr-Reid) against.*

*Ms. Vadlamani leaves the room at 17.17*

### **Librarian-Elect**

The President moves to ratify Mr. McGrath's interim report under SO A1

*Nem. con.*

### **Treasurer-Elect**

The Treasurer-Elect says that she has no business except to reiterate what has been said about the recruitment drive, and that members of committee need to share a couple more items on social media before the end of the open period.

### **Ms. Collins**

The President moves to ratify Ms. Collins' interim report under SO A1

*Nem. con.*

### **Ms. Dube**

*Ms. Dube has no business*

### **Ms. Timmons**

*Ms. Timmons has no business*

### **Ms. Faruk**

*Ms. Faruk has no business*

### **Mr. Webster**

*Mr. Webster has no business*

### **Ms. Joshi**

*Ms. Joshi has no business*

**Mr. Parr-Reid**

*Mr. Parr-Reid has no business*

The President returns to the Librarian-Elect's proposed rule change.

The Librarian-Elect says that he has written three amendments to the rules change he has proposed. He says that the first clarifies that in the RO's investigation into nominating speeches, the phrase "shall include, but not be limited to" has been altered to "shall include, at the bare minimum" to ensure that a Returning Officer could not commit innocent interference for an insufficiently large investigation. He says that the second amendment requires the RO to post the list of validly nominated candidates between 8pm and 9pm on Friday of sixth week, to allow for the grace period for re-submitting information before this time.

The President asks about the candidates' meeting at 7pm on Friday of sixth week.

The Returning Officer says that this is the case, and that in Trinity term potential candidates attended that meeting without knowing whether they were validly nominated candidates.

The Librarian-Elect says that his third amendment clarifies the grace period for resubmitting information to be by 8pm on Friday of sixth week.

The President says, on the rules change as a whole, that he thinks it brings the Union out of step with the rest of the working world by including deadline extension possibilities, and that whilst it might make it easier to nominate he does not think that the difficulty of nomination is currently a barrier to good candidates nominating.

The Returning Officer asks for a further clarification to the rules change to extend the window for declaration of those candidates for which further information is required to three hours.

The Librarian-Elect agrees to this.

The President asks whether this time window is too tight for the RO team.

The Returning Officer says that she thinks that three hours is a sufficient period, but that two hours may have been a bit tight.

The Secretary says that he has anecdotally heard many people complaining that the nomination process in the Union is difficult, and that part of their view of the Union as an opaque place is formed from the difficulty of nominating for election, with a very long nomination pack with many items to be included and boxes to tick. He says he thinks that not only is it good to allow for the grace period for a complicated process to allow people to correct themselves, but also that it sends a positive message that the Union is not here to catch people out with a complicated nomination form. The Secretary says that the goal of elections is to allow the members to choose who governs the society from as wide a base as possible by allowing as many people as possible to run in elections, and that people should not be prevented from doing so just because they have forgotten a particular item.

The Librarian agrees, but suggests that a better way to do this might be by disseminating information about how to nominate more widely.

Mr. Parr-Reid says that it is not that difficult to nominate in the society's elections.

The Treasurer-Elect says she agrees with the Secretary, and notes that after this election there will not be slates helping people fill out their nomination forms. She says that whilst failures to nominate have not been that frequent in the past, it might become more common in the future.

The Returning Officer says that she agrees with the Secretary that there are high barriers to nomination, but that marginal changes like this are not the best way to reduce these. She says she doesn't think this change has the scope to get rid of the barriers.

The Secretary says that he agrees with the Librarian that information about nominations should be more widely disseminated but that that is no reason not to make the process itself easier, and that it does have the scope to reduce the difficulty associated with nominations and that it is wrong to call the measures extraneous. He says he agrees with the Treasurer-Elect, and can personally attest that having run in 2 elections with a full slate and 1 election on a smaller team made up of people without large electoral experience, on the latter occasion two members of the team failed to nominate for reasons that he believes would have been rectified by this change.

The Chair of Consultative Committee clarifies that the reasons for these were lack of nomination fee and lack of appropriate contact details.

The President says that he shares this frustration that slates usually complete most of the nomination process for candidates, but that in the prior case someone who should have been able to give good guidance, gave bad guidance. He says he has never seen a truly independent candidate nominate invalidly as these candidates always take time to read the nomination packs. He says that when he was running on what he believed to be one of the most poorly organised, most ill-thought-through and incompetent slates in the history of the Union, he opened his nomination pack three times to check that the various vagrants running on the slate had not filled in the form incorrectly.

Ms. Faruk asks whether an amendment has been made to the process for the RO's investigation.

The Librarian-Elect clarifies the language changed here.

Ms. Collins says that being able to name historical failures to nominate suggests that there is clearly a problem at the moment.

The President says that we can name two cases.

Ms. Collins says that the fact this is a non-zero amount of cases means that a problem exists.

The President says that he thinks is a valid argument, and that he agrees this change means that anyone who wants to is able to run, including those who he thinks do not have the respect for the election to apply their Oxford level intellect to read a form. He believes that only those who have the respect for the Returning Officer to read the nomination form should be able to run.

Ms. Collins says that making this process marginally easier can only be a good thing.

The President says that it can be a good or bad thing.

Ms. Collins asks how it can be a bad thing.

The President says that this means people don't have to read the form, making it less likely they will read rule 33 and be aware of electoral malpractice provisions. He says that Returning Officers are available throughout the nomination process to advise people on how to nominate. He says that he believes we should do more to help people run in Union elections, but that those who need help are not those who cannot fill in forms but rather those who don't know how elections work or are concerned about slates.

The Librarian-Elect says that the President's strand of argument reminds him of arguments made by US Republicans about voter ID laws.

The President says that he thinks this remark is unfair.

The Librarian-Elect says that the President's argument is analogous to those saying that if someone cannot apply for the correct IDs and get them on time, then they have not earned the right to vote. He says that if you can make it easier for someone to vote or run for elections, it should just be done.

The Treasurer-Elect says she does not think Mr. Samuel Burns forgetting his manifesto can be equated with systematic racial policies to prevent voting in the United States.

The Librarian-Elect says that he is not seeking to bring the racial aspect into his point, but that the type of fallacious argument is the same.

The President says that he thinks in the US, parties seek to prevent individuals from voting based on the different faculties they possess. He says he thinks that in Oxford everybody possesses the same faculties to read a form and that there is no discriminatory or restrictive animus, as the only restriction is one's own willingness to read a form. He also says nominations are different to voting, and that whilst it should be easy to run, having a deadline for filling in a form is not a source of burning injustice.

The Librarian-Elect says that the only connection is the same kind of fallacious arguments that are being applied and not any racial element.

The Secretary says that the President is opposing this change on the basis that he thinks some people are too foolish to fill in a form.

The President says he is not labelling anyone, and that his first premise is that given that every member is a member of the University of Oxford, it is fair to assume they can all read a form. He also says that if a member has respect for the process of the elections, that member will be able to fill in the form. He therefore says that anyone who has respect for the process of elections will be able to validly nominate.

The Secretary says that he does not think that Mr. Samuel Burns failed to notice that manifestos can be included, but that the issue at hand is those who accidentally fail to include an object or piece of information. He says that he does not think it is unfair to allow candidates to correct for honest mistakes.

The President says that by allowing people to correct for mistakes, they can also be allowed to correct for other failures.

The Treasurer-Elect says she agrees with the Secretary that it is fair to allow people to correct for mistakes, and that just because someone has forgotten an email it does not mean they can be a good member of committee.

The Bursar says that she thinks this places a large burden on the Returning Officer, and that it should be ensured that this change doesn't make the work of the RO untenable.

The Returning Officer says that she is not particularly keen on imposing any larger burden on the RO, but that this change no longer represents an undue burden.

Ms. Faruk asks what would happen if the motion is defeated in Standing.

The President says that unless the motion receives  $\frac{2}{3}$  support, the motion must be moved either with signatures or at a future meeting.

The RO clarifies that if  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote for the motion, members of TSC cannot speak against it, but if only half vote for it then there are no consequences.

The Librarian asks for clarification on the final form of the motion before a vote is taken.

The Librarian-Elect reads through the amendments to his motion.

The Secretary moves that TSC recommend the Private Business Motion, with Friendly amendments, to the Public Business Meeting on the 25th October 2018.

*Seconded by the President-Elect*

*The motion fails, with four (The President-Elect, the Secretary, Ms. Collins, Ms. Joshi) in favour and four (The President, The Treasurer, Ms. Dube, Mr. Parr-Reid) against.*

### **The Returning Officer**

#### **DRO Shortlist**

The Returning Officer explains that on the DRO list are 8 DROs, 4 ex-ROs and one reserve. The list details the experience of each DRO, and she says that all have agreed to fulfil at least one RO duty.

The Secretary asks what ‘other electoral experience’ means in the cases of Mr. Dominic Brind, Ms. Louise Kandler and Mr. Joseph Sisson.

Ms. Kandler says she has been deputy Returning Officer and Returning Officer for the Oxford University Liberal Democrats.

The President says that Mr. Dominic Brind has acted as the count agent for Britain Stronger in Europe at a count in the 2016 European referendum and that Mr. Sisson has acted as a representative for a candidate in the count for the Oxford University Conservative Association.

The President asks if any of the ex-ROs are ISP in Oxford.

The Returning Officer says that Neb Jovanovic is.

The Returning Officer explains that the Standing Committee can issue a corporate objection to a DRO, or that individuals can issue anonymous objections. She says that objections can be submitted on the basis of suitability.

The President asks why there is only one reserve.

The Returning Officer says that only one additional application has been made.

The President asks about the order of seniority for Mr. Searle and Mr. Willis.

The Returning Officer says that this is largely arbitrary, but is to do with the timings of their appointments and roles as ROA.

The President-Elect asks about the CCC’s presence on the Scrutiny Committee, given that he would succeed to the normal DRO list upon the dismissal of one DRO.

The Chair of Consultative Committee says that he is willing to recuse himself if this would make officials more comfortable.

The Secretary asks for clarification on whether the reserve becomes a DRO upon the removal from the list of one normal DRO.

The Librarian-Elect asks what occurs if more than one DRO is no longer a DRO, meaning that there are insufficient DROs.

The Returning Officer says that TSC would have to approve further DRO nominations.

The Returning Officer moves that TSC ratify the DRO list for Michaelmas Term 2018

*Seconded by the President*

*Nem. con.*

The President asks the RO about the formation of an SDC shortlist, and whether her or the new RO will be responsible for this.

The Returning Officer says that a new list has to be passed this term at a Public Business Meeting, but that this need not be in her tenure.

### **The Chair of the Consultative Committee**

### **The Access Officers**

### **The Chair of the Debate Selection Committee**

### **Changes to the Composition of this Committee**

### **Any Other Business**

The Secretary asks if any progress has been made towards the ratification of the three Presidential appointments that have not yet been ratified.

The President says he will email all three tomorrow morning, and that two of the three attended first week access committee.

### **Date of Next Meeting**

- Monday of 3rd Week, Michaelmas Term 2018 at 16:00 in the President's Office

*The President closes the meeting at 17.45*

Signed,

**Nick Brown**  
*Magdalen College*  
Secretary