1. Report from the JCR President
2. Reports / Questions to Officers
3. Reading from the Poet Laureate

*A pre-pizza poem from Robert*

1. Ratifications from Previous Meetings

Procedural motion to bring unity board to first!!

1. Constitutional Amendments

**Academic Affairs and Suspended Students**

This JCR notes:

* That we currently have no formal JCR position in regards to supporting suspended students academically
* That LMH JCR recently adapted the role of their Academic Affairs officer to extend to Academic Affairs and Suspended Students Officer

This JCR believes:

* That suspended students suspend for a variety of reasons
* That suspended students aren’t sufficiently supported when they are away from college or returning to college
* That the Academic Affairs Officer has useful links with tutors and the SCR in order to liaise with college on academic issues on behalf of suspended students
* That suspended students should have a formal port of call to bring academic issues to

This JCR resolves:

* To change the title of the Academic Affairs Officer to be the Academic Affairs and Suspended Students Officer

**Proposed: Leila Parsa**

**Seconded: Graham Kelly**

SFQs:

Lucy H: any plans to mandate mental health officer to do this?

Leila: motion coming up to alter equal opps reps SOs to do this

Move to vote, no opposition, motion passes

1. Motions of No Confidence
2. Charities Motions
3. Monetary Motions

**OUSU Education Demo**

**This JCR notes:**

1. The Higher Education Bill is currently making its way through Parliament
2. The HE Bill contains proposals to increase tuition fees, and allow differentiation of fees between institutions based on highly questionable assessments of ‘Teaching Excellence’. It also proposes to form an ‘Office for Students’ with no student representation whatsoever.
3. With parliamentary approval, Oxford University already intends to increase fees for on-course students in 2017-18 to £9250
4. The NUS (National Union of Students) and the UCU (University and College Union) have called a national demo in London on November 19th for free, accessible and quality further and higher education across the UK, and to demand an end to the marketisation of university and college education.
5. That a full risk assessment of the demonstration is being undertaken by the NUS.
6. That NUS have taken measures to ensure that the demo is as accessible as possible and there will be specific provision for disabled students
7. OUSU has no budget line for protests and demonstrations and therefore cannot fund the event alone.
8. In 2014 and 2015 OUSU has organised for 2 coaches to take Oxford students to national demonstrations, thanks to financial support of common rooms.
9. Two coaches to transport students to and from London on November 19th would cost OUSU £1210.
10. In 1st week OUSU council, OUSU council passed £300 from its yearly discretionary budget to help fund the coaches.
11. In addition, OUSU intends to charge £3.66 at the point of booking (66p of which is a booking fee taken by the website). This is to ensure attendance, and also to help towards to cost.

**This JCR believes:**

1. Oxford students should be given the opportunity to speak out against changes that will significantly affect their access to education.
2. In addition to current students, if implemented, numerous policies in the HE Bill would be exceptionally detrimental to encouraging access and widening participation at Oxford, disproportionately affecting those from marginalised and/or underrepresented groups who have are more inclined to be debt averse.

**This JCR resolves:**

1. To donate £100 to OUSU to help with the costs of taking students to the United for Education Demo on November 19th 2016.

**Proposed: Jack Beadsworth**

**Seconded: Hannah Cheah**

**SFQ:**

Jack B: *Jemimah wrote this, not to blame for typos*

Hannah: *No, OUSU did.*

The rest of the JCR: decidedly nonplussed

Akshay: ‘believes’ used wrong – the whole thing falls apart if we don’t use the proper form

**Debate**:

Stef: OUSU looking for £400 total, daft for us to give £20; John’s gave £20, not that we should follow their lead, but we are smaller; not sure how much JCR interest there is to actually go; will probs amend down

Lucy H: agrees on interest

Stef: proposes amendment to cut to £30

Beady does not take as friendly

McGarry moves to vote on amendment to lower from £100 to £30

Now debating on amendment

Lucy H: What John’s did was pathetic

Stef agrees, says we shouldn’t be financing such a large chunk, esp. as such a small college

Hannah: motion not really about funding, more about showing support for demonstration

Stef: understands this, but role fo JCR is to represent JCR’s interests, not rich enough to support everything we ‘d want to

Leila: agrees, also says that this is more in everyone’s interest, not a specific interest like Brexit (@Akshay)

Move to vote on amendment: overwhelming pass

*Stef is now the proposer*

Rogan: has spoken to bursar about finances of college, wants to talk about; finances of college are NOT GREAT, shouldn’t be demonstrating against the college/uni

Henner: point of info: we’re protesting the govt., not the university

*Cameron McGarry moves to vote, no opposition*

***Motion passes unanimously***

**Buying a new amp**

This JCR Notes:

That one of our amplifiers is broken

That we need it to run the Christmas bop in the hall

Believes:

In the sanctity of the traditional Christmas bop in hall

Resolves:

To mandate the Treasurer to purchase a replacement amplifier for no more than £300.

**Proposed: Cameron McGarry  
Seconded: Yuki Murakami, not here now by Pete**

**SFQs**

Lucy H: how did it break?

Cameron: It’s unclear

Stef: have you broken to college about funding it?

Cameron: No

Oscar: how broken?

Cameron: not cheaper to fix than it is

Point of info from Thomas: he was scratching his head

**Debate**:

Stef: doesn’t know when bought, how old? Suspect it was broken by wear & tear. Should speak to college about funding, is quite a hefty piece of kit

Cameron: we bought the last one barney bought out of own pocket, JCR refunded – bought in Michaelmas 2013. Broke because ,STUFF HAPPENS AT BOPS (#CorpusBopFightClub). Main thing would change is that we couldn’t do Xmas bop. Cameron could think of a better setup less easily broken – we don’t need anything this complicated. Don’t actually think bop should be in hall (*Cameron was trying to be funny with his ‘believes’*)

Lucy H proposes amendment to mandate me to check if we can get it fixed, then ask college will buy/contribute to fixing. If both fail, authorize me to spend up to £300, but probably £200 on it.

*Taken as friendly.*

Bex : could we borrow someone else’s?

*Probably not, Bex. We broke the last one, who would lend to us, a JCR who famously cover everything they hold dear in crisps?*

Stef on how we’re doing with money: Levy has come in, Grant has not. We’re in deficit but when grant comes in we’ll have ~£2k left for the terms motions when it does.

Moving to vote on the new motion, with amendment. ***Passes with overwhelming majority*** *–*

1. Motions as submitted

**Opposing TEF**

This JCR notes

1. The HE Bill proposes to link fees to a highly dubious measure of teaching excellence called the teaching excellence framework (TEF).
2. The metrics for assessing ‘teaching excellence’ include graduate salary, student retention, scores from the NSS, and a written qualitive submission by the institution, and have been criticised widely by students and academics
3. Stage 2 of the TEF will be used to determine what level of fee increase English universities are allowed.
4. This will result in a differentiated system of tuition fees where institutions deemed to be ‘excellent’ will be able to charge higher levels than other institutions in the sector.
5. This paves the way to later stages of the TEF in which fees could be differentiated between subjects/courses.
6. All existing evidence focusing on access to Higher Education highlights that debt aversion disproportionately affects prospective students from the least socio-economically privileged backgrounds alongside other underrepresented groups when applying to university. (*at this point, Thomas came bounding down the stairs as he is wont to do, and some of the reading of the motion was obscured for Junior Members. Walk quietly, Thomas!!*)
7. The power to decide whether to enter TEF lies with the University of Oxford.
8. OUSU contributed extensively to the feedback on the Green and White Papers that preceded the Bill, opposing the majority of proposals.
9. The government has already turned maintenance grants and NHS bursaries into loans, curtailed the disabled students’ allowance and allowed interest to be charged on student loans.
10. The government’s decision to allow interest to be charged on student loans is in breach of the contracts that students signed, together with breaking the promise made to many university applicants.
11. These policies leave the poorest students with more than £53,000 debt after three years’ undergraduate study.
12. The participation rate increase for the poorest students has stagnated and 18-year-olds from the most disadvantaged backgrounds are 2.4 times less likely to apply.
13. If the TEF is implemented, fees could reach £11,697 by 2025-26.
14. The University of Oxford has already indicated to OFFA that they may increase fees for the 2017/18 academic year to £9,250 for new and continuing students.

This JCR believes

1. That fee increases resulting from entry into TEF, in conjunction with the government’s decision to allow interest to be charged on student loans, will discourage more students from less-privileged backgrounds from applying to university and in particular to the best universities.
2. Increased and differential fees between institutions and courses resulting from the TEF will have a hugely detrimental impact on access to Higher Education, particularly at Oxford.
3. The proposals of the HE Bill are contradictory to the professed aims of the Bill to increase accessibility to education.
4. Linking tuition fee rises to an assessment of teaching quality will have severe ramifications, entrenching inequality between higher education providers and contradicting the government’s ambitions around widening participation.
5. The proposed metrics for the TEF do not measure teaching experience and are therefore not fit for purpose as the National Student Survey scores provide only a limited measure of satisfaction, not quality of teaching.
6. That it is unfair to increase fees for students already on course and that it amounts to a betrayal of student trust.

This JCR resolves

1. To oppose Oxford University opting into the TEF from year two onwards.
2. To oppose the increase in fees for continuing students in particular. (*at this point I was distracted by a message from the man in charge of Encore Events. He called me a legend. I assume I didn’t miss anything*)
3. To mandate its officers to lobby the colleges Head of House and Governing Body to pressure the University of Oxford to not opt into TEF from year two onwards or increase fees for continuing students.

**Proposed: Alice Rubbra**

**Seconded: Ioan Phillips**

***Ioan absent -* Zereena has instead**

**SFQs**

Lucy H: what does the amendment re. officers mean?  
Henner: we’re gonna change that to president in Debate

**Debate**:

Cameron: amendment to change Resolves 3 from ‘officers’ to ‘president’; add a resolves 4 to add 1,2,3 to policy doc

*Move to vote*

***Passed with overwhelming majority****.*

**Suspended Students**

This JCR notes:

* That we currently have no formal provisions in the standing orders of any of our JCR officers in regards to supporting suspended students

This JCR believes:

* That suspended students suspend for a variety of reasons
* That suspended students aren’t sufficiently supported when they are away from college or returning to college
* That the Academic Affairs Officer has useful links with tutors and the SCR in order to liaise with college on academic issues on behalf of suspended students
* That the Academic Affairs Officer has not traditionally been viewed as a welfare-type position
* That the Welfare Officers and the Equal Opps President should also provide support for suspended students in a welfare capacity, and that this should be written formally into their standing orders

This JCR resolves:

* To add to the standing orders of the Academic Affairs Officer ‘to act as a point of contact for suspended students with academic queries or problems and to liaise with the Senior Tutor, Librarian and OUSU Academic Affairs Officer as appropriate’
* To add to the standing orders of the Welfare Officers, ‘to act as a point of contact for suspended students in a welfare capacity and liaise with the relevant people in college or beyond on their behalf’
* To add to the standing orders of the Equal Opps President and the Equal Opps Committee, ‘to act as a point of contact for suspended students in a welfare capacity and liaise with the relevant people in college or beyond on their behalf’

**Proposed: Leila Parsa**

**Seconded: Stephanie Paterson**

**SFQs, Debate**: none. ***No opposition, motion passes***

*This motion doesn’t need passed again, the other one about suspended students does*

Changing the Access and Admissions Officer Standing Orders

This JCR notes:

1. That the Access and Admissions Officer’s standing orders have not been updated for a while.
2. That new access opportunities and duties have been created in the time since the orders were created.

This JCR believes:

1. That the JCR should update the Access and Admissions Officer’s standing orders to fit the current duties of the role.

This JCR resolves:

To add these three clauses to the Access and Admissions Officer’s standing orders:

1. To update information on Corpus’ informal ‘Access and Outreach Committee’ Facebook page about access opportunities.
2. To involve the JCR with access opportunities outside of school tours and open days, such as liaising with educational charities about volunteering spaces and offering Corpus as a venue for access-related events.
3. To provide access related events during Unity Week.

**Proposed: Alice Rubbra**

**Seconded: Ioan Phillips** -***Thomas Munro*** *sefonds*

No **SFQs**, No **debate**, ***motion passes***

**Providing Rape Alarms**

This JCR notes that

1. According to OUSU, one in seven university-age women will experience serious physical or sexual assault while at university
2. Many rapes and cases of sexual assault are not reported
3. Something must be done to attempt to prevent rape and sexual assault
4. Everyone and anyone can be a victim of such a crime

This JCR believes

1. Sexual assault and rape are heinous crimes.

This JCR resolves

1. To mandate the Welfare officers to provide rape alarms free of charge to all Corpus students who request them
2. To mandate the Welfare officers to provide rape alarms in Freshers' welcome packs to supplement the provision of condoms and lubricant
3. To mandate the Committee to promote sexual consent throughout college
4. To mandate the Welfare officers to liaise with the respective university staff in order to make consent workshops in Fresher's week compulsory (unless a valid reason is provided - validity is deemed by College staff, the Welfare officers, and/or those running the workshop)

**Proposed: Zereena Arshad**

**Seconded: Alexander Grassam-Rowe**

Resolves 4 has to go to policy document

**SFQs**

Stef: how mcuh cost?

Zereena: best quality between £4 & £5

Lucy H: how many freshers each year?

Me: 74

**Debate**:

Leila: good idea, but v expensive – dow e want to provide those identify as female only, then opt-in for anyn esle – or opt-in entirely

Zereena: not just women who aresexually assauted; open to have opt in

Oscar: should make equal, look at everyone. Make opt-in due to cost

Lucy H: shouldn;t just say ‘‘only for women‘, opt-in thing might not work cause you wouldn’t know you needed it before arriving

Alexander: should open up to all. If we can get them for £1.98, and make workshops compulsory, bring up

Leila: would this tie us to doing it very year? (yes)

Stef: a v personal issue, people deal with in v v different ways, people might feel uncomfrtable having them forced upon them in freshers packs – have in a basket like condoms, so no pressure about getting one, means it’s not jsut freshers. Other issue is £££

Xav: How many would go in the box?

Stef: rather than setting a number, would leae to weelfare officers‘ discretion

Leila: JCR should obvs have our trust, if things go wrong then change

*Stef proposes amenemdent to strike resolves 2, add a resolves 5, adding 3 & 4 to policy doc*

*Stef would say to add £100 to welfare budget to facilitate this.*

Oscar: open box of these is too open to abuse, reasonable to expect students to approach welfare officers

Leila has forgotten what she was gong to say

Cameron: having the supply is the only reasonalbe way – don’t want to go for cheap alarms, last thing you want is them failing

Lucy: not sure she would have been able to aporach as a fresher, thinks the supply wll be fine

Hannah thinking a similar system to the pregnancy test one

Stef in favour of supply system

Oscar: if someone messes with them we’re fucked.

Stef on amendment: we have some JCR trust issues rn but people respect our supplies, need to trust the JCR, can reassess at a later date if it’s not working

Martha agrees with supply

Zareena: JCR furniture doesn;t make a poltiical sttement, rape alarms do

Oscar: only takes one person to do something wrong to fuck us up

Alex: on point about trusting JCR – we have to put some trust in the JCR. Should make workshops compulsory to make people realise severity

Rogan: accessibulity is important, would prefer the supply system

Stef: a box in the plummer is v v different from the JCR, which is often full of drunk, stupid people – havign them int he plummer makes them far less liekly to get msessed with - would have to be a really thought out, disgusting thing to mess with them

Pete: we have CCTV right outside Plummer

*Amendment is taken as friendly.*

Sam: do coll support complulsory workshops?

Lucy: not technically compulsory

Stef: survivors mght feel triggered if made complusroy

Alex: original proposal accounts for this

*Lucy H proposes amendment to replace ‘valid reason‘ with telling workshop runners not attending*

Stef: make compulsory unless uncomfortable with attending.

*Taken as hostile – debate!*

Zereena: what if idiots use that as excuse not to go when the whole pointis to educate *them*

Leila: we’ve had really good attendave

Lucy H: why are we changing attendance clause then?  
Stef: whole point is to make people aware, understand – we’re trying to

*Lucy H amends to strike clause 4, remove from 5. Taken as friendly.*

Back to debate on motion as a whole!

Stef: £100 only for this term, in future will add to Budget

*Now a monetary motion*

Zereena amends to mandate Welfare to publicise rape alrms. *Friendly*

*Overwhelming majority,* ***motion passes***

1. Emergency Motions

This JCR notes:

The creation of the unity board was an amazing group effort and the centre piece of unity week not only last year but the year before

That the unity board was vandalised at some point over the last week end

This JCR believes:

That it would be a nice idea to replace the unity board as soon as possible

That as a JCR community we stand by everything the unity board represented

This JCR resolves:

To mandate the arts officer to buy a direct replacement canvas by corpus care week (5th week)

**Proposed: Tom Spink  
Seconded: Saskia M-Ballantyne (now by Leila)**

**Procedural motion moved to first!!**

**Short factual questions**

*Lucy: when decorated?*

*Leila: Corpus Cares*

**Deabte**

Cameron: last one was big, were told we couldn’t put it anywhere but in the corner because of health & safety etc., think about size – (*point of information for Ioan, who is not here*)

Moved to vote, no oppo – motion passes

1. Any other Business