

JCR Meeting Minutes

Michaelmas 2015 Week 4

Chair: Bethany Currie/Ed Green
Secretary: Ed Green/Henner Petin
Returning Officer: Henner Petin

- I. Report from the President
- II. Reports/Questions to Officers
Adrian: when is the JCR bike sale?
Stef: Soon.
- III. Reading from the Poet Laureate
- IV. Ratifications from Previous Meetings

Meeting minutes ratified

1. Oh so boring

This JCR notes:

1. Concerning the JCR Levy, Article 3, part 7 of the JCR Constitution reads: "The amount of the levy will be set every academic year by the JCR Treasurer, subject to approval by a two thirds majority vote at two consecutive JCR Meetings. The level of the levy shall be submitted at the 4th week Trinity JCR Meeting, and ratified at the 6th. Failure to reach an approved sum shall mean the amount of the previous academic year's levy is carried over";
2. Article 8, part 12 reads "The level of the JCR Levy may be changed by a motion passed in two consecutive JCR meetings by a two thirds majority."

This JCR believes:

1. The JCR constitution is confusing and self-contradictory.
2. Frequent changes to the amount of the levy would be disruptive and undesirable but the Trinity deadline is pretty arbitrary, and too restrictive when the financial situation of the JCR can change significantly during the course of a year.
3. The JCR should be able, by passing a motion with a two thirds majority in consecutive JCR meetings, to change the level of the JCR levy during any term.

This JCR resolves:

1. To strike Article 3, Part 7.
2. To amend Article 8, Part 12 to read: "The level of the JCR Levy may be changed only by a motion brought by the JCR Treasurer and passed in two consecutive JCR meetings by a two thirds majority. Such a motion may only be brought once a

term. If no motion is passed, the amount of the previous term's levy shall be carried over."

Proposed: Kate Ogden

Seconded: Adrian Matthew

Short Factual Questions: none

Debate: none

Opposition: none

Motion Passes

2. aLEVYating the Deficit

This JCR notes:

1. The JCR levy has not been revised in the lifetime of most JCR members; it was set at £5 in 1996. Inflation means it is now worth 59.6% of what it was when it was set (calculated using UK RPI);
2. According to the college's audit, the JCR ran a deficit last calendar year of £7883.49, reducing our surplus from £12018.69 to £4135.20. The JCR's expenditure has exceeded its income over the last 2 terms;
3. Corpus' levy is low compared to those of other JCRs in Oxford; the majority set their levy at £10 a term.

This JCR believes:

1. The JCR's current financial situation is unsustainable;
2. Budget cuts help but can only go so far; if we want nice things we have to pay for them;
3. The chance of negotiating an increase in the college grant is slim; other funding options (such as corporate sponsorship) can be looked at but also seem unlikely to be successful;
4. Many JCR members will not notice an additional £3 a term, but the impact on the JCR's finances will be significant and positive (generating an additional £700 a term);
5. The opt-out system will be continued, so any students who would be unable to afford the additional expense would not be forced to pay it.

This JCR resolves:

1. To mandate the President and/or Treasurer to ask the Bursary to consider increasing the College Grant, and to look at alternative funding options and to review the way in which charges are deducted from the Levy;
2. To increase the termly JCR levy from £5 to £10.

Proposed: Kate Ogden

Seconded: Nikhil Venkatesh/Adrian Matthew

Short factual questions: none

Debate: none

Opposition: none

Motion Passes

V. Constitutional Amendments

VI. Motions of No Confidence

VII. Charities Motions

VIII. Monetary Motions

1. Motion to fund BARS bring Cecile Emeke to Oxford

This JCR notes:

1. The Black Association of Rhodes Scholars (BARS) annually hosts a speaker at Rhodes House in honour of Black History Month in October or November.
2. This year, they are hoping to bring Jamaican-British filmmaker Cecile Emeke to speak.
3. Cecile Emeke has been featured in the [New York Times](#), the [BBC](#), and [OkayAfrica](#) for her cinematic work on the black diaspora and efforts to [decolonise film](#).
4. This event will (hopefully) be on November 20th from 5-7pm and will feature a screening of Emeke's short film 'Ackee and Saltfish', with a facilitated discussion and audience questions afterwards.
5. Emeke's short film series 'Strolling' (and its French, Dutch and Italian counterparts 'Flâner', 'Wandelen' and 'Passegiando') features a wide range of discussions from members of the black diaspora including feminist, disability, and LGBTQ+ issues – issues relevant to many, but not given the platform it deserves.
6. This work, although incredibly important, is not particularly lucrative.
7. Cecile Emeke is requesting a £500 honorarium and travel expenses from London as payment for this event.

This JCR believes:

1. Our JCR should support black women, who are almost always a minority in their respective fields and are economically disadvantaged in our society.
2. Much of media discussion about blackness is from an American point of view, so work that centres Black British and diasporic perspectives is important.
3. The work of Cecile Emeke allows all liberation movements to make their work truly intersectional by listening to, and learning from, black voices.

This JCR resolves:

1. To donate £100 to BARS for this event.

Proposed by: Jemimah Taylor

Seconded by: Shahryar Iravani

Short Factual questions:

Adrian: Where is it being held?

Beth: Rhodes House, north Oxford

Kate: What relation does BARS have to Corpus?

Jemimah: None, but they are short of money and we could help them

Adrian: Can we afford it? Is £100 acceptable?

Kate: We can afford it.

Jemimah: It can be less, but if she [Cecile] ends up with more money then that wouldn't be a bad thing as far as I'm concerned.

Debate:

Lucy: We would be paying a 5th of it on our own, there must be other colleges involved? Considering our money problems is this not a bit much?

Jem: Some other colleges have submitted motions, they aren't necessarily going to pass, so I don't think we can assume that the money will necessarily be raised. People have been having trouble to get a speaker and the funds for them for Black History Month, for example.

Redha: Can I amend it to do it conditionally?

Amend resolves (1)

To donate £50 to BARS immediately, and then to donate an additional £50 if they are unable to raise the £500 required

Taken as Friendly

Kate: I don't think that it's the JCR's responsibility to fund an event that we don't have a remit for and that we have no direct connection to.

Jemimah: I amend my motion to take it out of the Charities Fund instead, as we have a surplus.

Automatically Taken as Friendly (Proposer of the Motion)

Finn: I amend the motion to take the money from the JCR account, not the charities fund.

Taken as unfriendly, debate on the amendment begins

Ashkay: This is money that isn't being spent by charities anyway, so it makes sense to use it here.

Finn: This motion is probably going to pass anyway so we should take it from the JCR rather than the charities money which we could spend on something else

Ed: They haven't just asked colleges to donate, and we're probably down for some intersectionality. The LGBTQ Society can't donate to it [BARS] because it is not a charity.

Kate: Whether or not this is specifically a charity or not, we could donate to the BARS in any case, but this looks like it fits into the charities remit rather than the JCR's.

Jem: We have done this from the JCR budget before, e.g. Unity Week. People are involved in campaigns like Rhodes Must Fall. It's nice to help an event that might educate people.

Jemimah: Reason that I'm happy to do it from charities because I think it's fine to take it from the surplus. This money has been sitting there for years.

Redha: What is the charities surplus?

Jemimah: About £350, so we wouldn't be blowing the whole surplus

Sammy: Just because we have a surplus doesn't mean that we have to spend it, but it's not like if we give to this other charities will be losing out.

Move to Vote on amendment; no opposition.

For 4, absentions, 7, against 16ish

Amendment falls. Debate returns to the original motion.

Sasha: It feels a bit weird given that there is a Rhodes Must Fall movement that we support and yet we're donating to something in the Rhodes House. Can you explain?

Jem: RMF was set up by Rhodes Scholars who wanted to point out that he was not a nice guy. They are in full support of this event.

Peter: Are they charging entry, and if so where is the money going?

Jemimah: I don't think they are charging, but I don't know.

Move to vote on the motion as a whole; no opposition

For 19, abstentions 12, against 1

Motion passes

IX. Motions as Submitted

1. Peer Support Training

This JCR notes:

1. The Corpus peer support scheme has 6 places available every year and occurs in Hilary term
2. The peer support training includes confidentiality, crisis training, and general welfare-type things
3. The welfare officers deal with all of these things
4. The welfare officers are not mandated to be peer support trained
5. The welfare officers at many other colleges are mandated to be peer support trained (including Jesus, St Annes, Pembroke, Exeter, St Johns, Magdalen, Lincoln, and many others)

This JCR believes:

1. It would be helpful for the welfare representatives to be peer support trained
2. Welfare officers would like to be trained in welfare support
3. Organising welfare events like Corpus Cares would be easier if there was a clear link between welfare and peer support

This JCR resolves:

1. To update the welfare officers' standing orders so that at least one is trained during any given term by adding to 'Duties' in the standing orders of both welfare (female) and welfare male
'To ensure that they or their counterpart have undergone or are undergoing Peer Support training with the Counselling Service so that at any given point, at least one of the two officers is trained'
2. To enforce this change in Hilary Term 2016

Proposed: Sandy Downs [becomes Sammy Breen]

Seconded: Sammy Breen [becomes Mary Trend]

Short factual questions:

Lucy: is there formal training for welfare officers?

Sammy: there is no mandatory training, no

Ashkay: When is the training?

Sammy: Hilary Term, Welfare Officer (Male) elected in Trinity, Welfare Officer (Female) elected in Michaelmas

Luke: Could a female run in her first year for welfare rep?

Sammy: Yes so long as she committed to be trained in Hilary

Debate:

Luke: What are the benefits?

Iona: Confidentiality training for example, sensitivity training, help people with their problems

Sandy: Peer Support training covers how to deal with crises, cultural awareness, big problems that come up in Freshers' Week. Welfare do the same, therefore it makes sense to be trained in similar circumstances. Kind of people who are welfare officers want to be trained anyway

Luke: Peer Support training is a huge time commitment, people have dropped out of it. Hope that it doesn't limit the number of people, especially on the male welfare side

Jem: Would this mean that we would have less Peer Supporters?

Sandy: They would still be Peer supporters. There would only be 5 positions to apply for rather than 6. We had six applications last year for six places.

Lucy: Because the welfare support deal with different issues, shouldn't they both have some kind of training?

Sandy: The aim is to have a convention that both would be trained. Nightline training can conflict with Peer Support training, and one of the conditions of being Nightline trained is that it is confidential that you do so.

Jem: Why are only 6 people trained?

Kate: It's nearly £1900 to train six people and the JCR bears half of that cost.

Sandy: Training is transferrable, you could use it in other parts of your life.

Redha: Would it be possible to assign someone who isn't peer support trained to brief the Male Welfare Officer in Michaelmas?

Mary: There is OUSU training on offer for welfare officers.

Jem: Add an amendment to make attending welfare training mandatory?

Taken as friendly

Move to vote on the motion; no opposition

Vote on the motion; no opposition

Motion passes

X. Emergency Motions

1. Creation of a Staff Liaison Officer

This JCR notes:

1. The vital contribution made by college staff to student happiness and wellbeing at Oxford;
2. That staff pay and working conditions can be inadequate and vulnerable to top-down change;
3. The impressive success of the Oxford Living Wage campaign in advancing the living wage and accreditation over 2014-15;
4. The difficulties faced by groups such as the Oxford Living Wage campaign in establishing reliable channels of communication with college hierarchies on staff-related issues;
5. The potential conflict of interests involved for the JCR Treasurer in working to improve staff pay and conditions given their close professional cooperation with college employers/the Domestic Bursar.

This JCR believes:

1. In solidarity between the students and staff – academic and non-academic - in our community;
2. The Oxford Living Wage campaign has proved itself an effective vehicle of workplace improvement across Oxford University;
3. To avoid paternalist connotations, solidarity action needs to actively communicate with and include the workforce;
4. Positive workplace change is best achieved and secured with the direct participation of the workers in efforts to achieve it;
5. Student efforts to improve our staff's pay and conditions should not be defeated by college obstructionism;
6. In order to better support the Corpus Christi College workforce and give it the respect it deserves as such an important contributor to our daily wellbeing, we need a JCR Officer specially designated as a liaison between the student community and the non-academic staff.

This JCR resolves:

1. To create the non-Committee position of a "Staff Liaison Officer", elected in the Michaelmas term elections;
2. To create the following standing orders for the "Staff Liaison Officer"
 1. To attend all non-academic staff meetings and Living Wage meetings as the JCR's representative;
 2. To report back to the JCR on these meetings;
 3. To act as a point of contact for students concerned with staff-related issues and help organise joint student-staff activities on behalf of the JCR;
3. To update the Constitution to reflect this new position.

Proposed: Lily Aaronovitch

Seconded: Jem Jones

Short Factual Questions:

Lucy: what are the difference between committee and non-committee?

Kate: Committee members do tea, but also get a jumper, have a meal once a term etc.

Kate: How is the living wage campaign going?

Beth: College pay slightly above the Living Wage, but college refuses to accredit with the Living Wage Campaign, they said that they would be accountable to the student body. We have a good pension scheme and a good wage structure.

Debate:

Kate: The position is being created to some extent so that I don't have to fight with the bursary over the Living Wage, but that has never been an issue

Beth: that's because I have the more tense relationship with them

Jem: Useful to exist as someone who is friendly with the scouts who can tell us when we're being dicks, and if there is a problem with the scout. IF there is a problem then we can talk about it

Luke: I think that the treatment of staff is one of the most important things that the JCR does, and other colleges have been really good at getting Living Wage accredited led by the JCR President. If we give the job to someone non-committee it might be treated less seriously

Sammy: It seems to be the idea of having one person who gets all the problems, but there are already methods of doing this. There are officers who already deal with staff, and it depends on them having a good relationship with staff. What happens if they fall out with the staff. Not sure if it's a solution to the problem.

Jem: Not necessarily be the person who everyone complains to, but it would help to have a focal contact point. Wouldn't reduce importance of the role that it's not on committee, to a great extent it depends on what the President is interested in, just means that they focus on that, Beth has focused on Living Wage, that's how it works.

[Chair cedes Chair, Ed becomes chair, Henner becomes Secretary]

Alice: Not terrible idea, but student shouldn't have special responsibilities like that because of confidentiality issues.

Sammy: the scout would have to go via the officer officially, but actually in practice the scout will just address the issue with the student directly. Generally our relationship with scouts is good and we don't mind them telling us something.

Beth: Lower paid workers of Oxford are often very silent. The officer is not meant to be a voice for complaint, but is instead meant to be a means of the JCR taking responsibility for the treatment of scouts etc. on behalf of the student body. Lots of scouts are anonymously contributing to college and they should have a voice too. E.g. other colleges have a real staff/student relationship.

Luke: Corpus' treatment of staff generally good. Example: Cherwell article about especially bad behaviour of other college's student body. Corpus did not appear there.

Beth: That is because Corpus did not contribute data to the piece

Luke: not a good idea to put up this non-committee position; less serious elections and nominees. The position should be on committee, perhaps exec part (on par with treasurer/president/vice president)

Kate: that would be a big constitutional change, shouldn't be done in emergency motion. Wondering about the meetings, can we change it so that they attend the meeting that they are invited to?

Amendment taken as friendly

Lucy: How would the officer actually help with cleaning issues for instance a student vomiting. What would they practically do?

Beth: The point is that the student body can approach that scout in the example, buy flower etc. the officer would organise this. And that we'd have a focal point to build up a relationship between the scouts and the JCR.

Sammy: The non-academic meetings are not really concerned with welfare/and that stuff

Beth: I will meet with college to discuss this, but we are talking about creating a specific meeting for this purpose.

Kate: We pay the college to clean up the vomit, £50.

Sammy: if you vomit, you are asked to tip your scout by Hannah.

Q: why not integrate into domestic?

Beth: College wants to mediate everything so we cannot develop the culture we want between student body and college. To overcome these obstructions we should have a designated officer. He/she wouldn't have to compromise their position.

Q: what's stopping the liason from happening now?

Beth: I have to remain a professional relationship with the college's officials. This is happening in mediation with them though.

Jem: Domestic officer has many extra jobs already. Dichotomy: domestic officer is committee and deals with kitchen staff. Why shouldn't the officer dealing with other staff also be committee

Peter: Where would the position be if the non-academic staff don't want to be joined in the meetings. Redundant?

Jem: Living wage campaign and work inwards to the student body would still happen, but the rest would be a problem.

Redha: Amendement, Postpone the motion to next week. We should know what direction we want this to go in. More democratic to have a proper motion next time.

Beth: We'd have to debate it again anyway.

Jem: we can discuss it as many times as we want, and amend it as many times as we want.

Redha: procedural motion that the motion should not be put. 3.1.iii.

Chair: We would suspend debate on this motion to 6th week. It would have to pass then and in 8th week. If the motion were to be successful and the position created, then there would then be a by-election in Hilary. Any opposition to this?

Iona: clarification please. Will we have amendment next week?

Jem: We will debate it as a new motion in 6th week.

Q: Are we allowed to postpone or do we have to resubmit?

Chair: We can postpone and the a new motion can be put in 6th week with additions that the JCR deems appropriate.

Jem: Lily/Beth will receive suggestions and then a new motion will be put.

[Different points are raised and clarifications made by the Chair and the proposers as well as Beth. At last, the procedural motion is voted on]

Vote on the procedural motion

Against: 11. Abstentions: 5 Favour: 14

The procedural motion passes. Debate on the motion has ceased.

XI. Any Other Business

1. Reach Scholarship

College has given support, but there are some more loopholes to jump through. Need the JCR to show support for a Levy, so that we can bring a motion about actually paying the Levy. This vote is to display the will of the JCR.

Yes: Overwhelming majority

No: None.

2. Vacation Residence

Beth: licence begins on a Tuesday, college has agreed to come back on Saturday. One way is to extend licence back to Tuesday, or the other way is to have the rooms available and you choose. Only for Hilary and Trinity. Debate with Mark over Michaelmas

Option One: 0

Option Two: 0

Option Three: All of the people