OPEN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS ASSOCIATION

Central Executive Committee (CEC)
14 – 16 July 2017

REMIT REVIEW

The CEC is asked to:-

i) discuss this paper

1. Introduction

1.1 With elections for a new Central Executive Committee scheduled for late spring 2018 it is necessary to review both the composition of the CEC and the tasks undertaken by its members before determining if the existing role descriptions adequately reflect the roles and if the composition of the CEC needs to be changed.

2. The Process

2.1 As a first step all CEC members have been asked to provide a detailed breakdown of their workload relating it to their published remits to determine how much is done within the remit and also to indicate what other work they do and whether this is due to their position or due to expertise / interest. Central Committee Representative work (unless ex officio or by specific appointment) was excluded from this.

2.2 While some responses are still awaited it is clear that the work being done is often significantly more than the remit indicates something which had already been commented by many newly elected members who felt the electoral material for 2016 had understated the workload. We are also, possibly, victims of our success with the University seeking more student input at various levels.

2.3 When all responses have been received there will then be a clear snapshot of the CEC’s operation which will lay the groundwork for the review as a whole.

3 Proposed Review

3.1 I propose that the scope of this review be broad and that rather than rearranging tasks it considers a ground up rebuilding of the roles. It is very likely that in many cases there will be little change. In the case of the new
roles introduced in 2016 – particularly the FARs – it will be an opportunity to assess how they have worked and where the current post holders see the role developing. For the AARs it will allow for the incorporation of the results of the Grassroots project into their remit.

3.2 For all posts I feel we should also review the extra work that the CEC undertakes in terms of membership of various working groups. Is it always necessary to have an elected member on these or could the skills of experienced Central Committee Reps be utilised? By removing some tasks from the CEC it might allow members to concentrate more on their specific roles and the strategic leadership of the Association.

3.3 Alongside this there should also be a review of the CEC’s composition. Currently, if all posts were filled the CEC would comprise 22 members (President, Deputy President, seven VPs, four FARs, eight AARs and the Student Member of Council). For most of the term it has operated with 18 / 19 members and in the immediate future is likely to increase to 20/21 members. This is significantly larger than the previous CEC which operated with 14 (out of a possible maximum of 20) members for most of its term. Is it too large and is there scope for reducing numbers? If so, from where?

3.4 Moving forward, I suggest a small working group of VP Administration and the General Manager with support from the CEC as required start the process. There will be an opportunity for the CEC to discuss on an informal basis in September with a formal paper to be presented at a later CEC – probably January given expected work in the Autumn over Rules Revision and the ongoing OU Redesign project.
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