1. Report from the JCR President

Recap Officers Report. Inter alia: Well done on Unity Week. Definitely Gender Neutral Sign in Auditorium Toilet.

1. Reports / Questions to Officers

Akshay announces BME Rep By-eleciton to be held very soon.

Stef is not here, but Leila to bring some points that Stef has told here in advance.

1. Reading from the Poet Laureate
2. Ratifications from Previous Meetings
3. Constitutional Amendments

RON, Remove and Repeat

This JCR notes:

1. Candidates for non-committee positions are not currently subject to ‘None of the Above’ votes

2. ‘None of the Above’ is a key part of the democratic process

3. ‘Joke’ candidates, if the only ones standing, can win elections and are unable to be removed under the current constitution

This JCR believes:

1. All positions elected by the JCR should be subject to ‘None of the Above’ votes in elections

2. All positions elected by the JCR should be subject to motions of no confidence

This JCR resolves:

1. To amend article 4 part 37 to read ‘for each JCR-elected position, a choice of ‘None of the Above’ shall be available’
2. To remove article 4 part 39 from the constitution
3. To amend article 6 part 73 to read ‘A motion of no confidence can be brought by any JCR member at any JCR meeting if they can provide evidence of consistent breach by any elected JCR official of their standing orders or another serious misdemeanour’
4. To amend article 6 part 75 to read ‘If a motion of no confidence in any elected JCR official is passed by a two-thirds majority in any quorate JCR meeting this will result in their immediate removal from office.’

Proposed: Lucy Hirst

Seconded: Shahryar Iravani

(continued from page 1)

SFQ: None.

Debate: None.

No opposition. The motion passes unanimously.

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

Sailing Cuppers Reimbursement

This JCR notes:

1. That in 2nd week, a small group of Corpus students took part in Sailing Cuppers.
2. That Josh Bell had to pay the entry fee of £50 (£25 per team) out of his own pocket up front, under the impression that Clubs & Socs would be able to reimburse him.
3. That Josh has since been told that Clubs & Socs are unable to reimburse him.
4. That Joe Gough had a similar problem last Trinity, and is also £50 out of pocket.
5. That one of the Corpus teams this year came 4th overall in the competition.

This JCR believes:

1. That we should support JCR members in their sporting endeavours, where possible.
2. That Corpus representation in this and in other sporting events is to be encouraged.

This JCR resolves:

1. To reimburse Josh and Joe a total of £25 each.

Proposed: Joshua Bell

Seconded: Joe Gough (not present). Graham Kelly seconds the motion in his place.

SFQ:
Adam: How many people on a sailing team. Josh: 4.

Paul: Why not Clubs and Socs? Josh: We thought it wouldn’t be an issue, but it should have been a part of the initial budget that Jo brought to college. In future it should be in the budget.

Olli: Is this for all subsequent sailing cuppers? Henner: no, it can’t be.

Debate:
Kate: Someone needs to oppose it on Stef’s behalf. Adam: We shouldn’t reimburse people who assumed, because the budget is very limited. 50 pounds for 8 people makes 6 pounds each, that’s not too much.

Peter: This is the second time this happened - foresight?

Josh: different last time, Jo had agreed that this would go in but the thing got dropped. Agreed it’s not ideal, but it’s not the same circumstances as last year. If anyone really doesn’t think this is fair, we could amend it to less.

Graham: Amendment to give Josh and Jo £25 each. Taken as friendly by Josh.

Moving to vote: overwhelming majority. The motion passes.

Getting a gas BBQ

This JCR notes

* BBQs in the summer can be great.
* The BBQ at the tortoise fair was slow, left people queuing for a long time, and meant some people’s burgers were uncooked.

This JCR believes that

* A gas BBQ would prevent this problem in the future.
* A good BBQ would last a long time and be used for many events.

This JCR resolves

* To mandate the Treasurer to approach college on whether a gas BBQ is in accordance with Health and Safety.
* Provided that the boat club is willing to pay half of the price, to mandate the Treasurer to purchase a gas BBQ up to the value of £200

Proposed: Molly Willett

Seconded: Adam Wigley

SFQ:
Akshay: we need to mandate someone. Amendment proposed by Adam to mandate the Treasurer.

Lucy: Why gas? Molly explains the advantages of continuous cooking available with gas bbq.

Ed: have you checked with college about Health and Safety (H&S)? Molly: No.

Kate: What are the chances the boat club replaces their own and we can borrow that?

Molly: It would be beneficial to have an agreement between boat club and bbq.
Kate: Share?

Debate:
Leila mentions the problems with constantly passing monetary motions (on behalf of Stef).
Paul: Vote it down and check with college first.

Adam: Amendment to first check with college that this is in agreement with H&S and then mandate the treasurer.

Kate: not useful this term anymore. We’re not going to use it this term, takes a few weeks. Why get it now?
Adam: For boat-club purposes in Michaelmas.

Lucy: We should split then between boat-club and JCR.
Molly: it’s around £150-200.
Adam: We can get different quality BBQ, the good ones would last us several years with a good gas bottle.

Milo: It’s because they pressurize the gas.

Molly: We could put it to the boat-club committee to share the costs.

Tom: Amendment to check with club and if they’re willing to pay half then we go ahead splitting the costs.
Taken as friendly

Kate: College won’t like gas.
Jamie: College have it themselves and it should be possible to store it.

Molly: We’re checking with college anyway.

Recap motion as it is: ask about H&S first, then, provided the boat club meets the JCR half way in covering the cost, buy one up to £200.
Lucy: why do it now then?

Molly: Get it in place right now.

Kate: Shouldn’t we wait until they’re cheaper (Josh’s point).

Akshay: The treasurer can simply do it at a later point and we can mandate that.

Leila: We can’t afford this right now. We shouldn’t do it this term, seeing that neither boat-club nor JCR really has the money now.

Miriam: It wouldn’t actually happen this term anyway. With boat club being consulted it’s going to be bought for/in Michaelmas.

Josh: Let’s wait because we have to pass the £1000 motion up next.

Leila: We should have Stef here.

Move to vote. In favour: 3. The Motion fails.

Getting the ball rolling financially

**This JCR Notes:**

1. That planning for the Corpus Quincentenary Ball, that is to take place in June 2017, is well underway; a committee has been created and a proposal submitted to the college
2. That the planning and organisation of such a prestigious event will inevitably incur financial costs prior to any ticket sales (primarily through advertising, marquee & entertainment deposits, and website creation)
3. That the JCR has a strong relationship with the Corpus Ball given the large number of JCR members likely to attend and sitting on the committee
4. The JCR is required to give £2000 in order to underwrite the ball as per Article 5, Section 23 of the constitution.
5. That the Corpus Ball Committee are seeking substantial amounts of money from other sources including sponsorship from local and national companies as well as a loan from the college

**This JCR Believes:**

1. That it is important to support this event in to ensure that the Corpus Quincentenary Ball is a success for the entire college community
2. That in order for this event to be viable in the “pre ticket sales stage” it requires financial input from sources other than ticket sales

**This JCR Resolves:**

1. To provide a loan of up to £1000 to the Corpus Quincentenary Ball Committee as and when money is required
2. To ensure that the loan is paid back at 10% interest to the JCR upon sale of the 56 “early bird tickets” in Michalemas term

Proposed: Peter Woodcock
Seconded: Molly Willett

SFQ:

Kate: How much money do we have?

Leila: Quote Stef’s message ‘that at the rate we’re spending at JCR meetings we may dip below the £3000 mark this term. So we can probs only give 2. Also: what’s the problem with more of it being a loan (all of it please) because they’re not allowed to profit anway – so surely they have to give it back to us. Can we amend to say £2000 loan and no donation – would be ideal!’

Debate.

Kate: Is this to give or to loan?

Ed: The £2000 is constitutionally given.

Kate: Constitutionally a problem and contradiction.

Pete: We’re going on £2000 anyway. This is separate.

Akshay: Unless there’s an explicit motion against the £2000, it should have been in the budget or will be next term.

Molly: When is next terms budget? We need the money before ticket sales. Early in Michaelmas.
Henner: The budget will be 2nd week Michaelmas.

Jemimah: They had £2000 previously, but the previous balls did not have this extra support.

Kate: A lot of money, right? Has to be judged against our financial situation. Stef wants it all to be a loan.

Jamie: We can’t have a ball without money. If we don’t sell tickets, we can’t have a ball. We want a quincentenary ball.

Kate: But we will be buying tickets.

Molly: There will be consultation about ticket price soon to make sure the sale will work.

Graham: Proposes an amendment to take it at 500 for the time being.

Taken as hostile.

 Amendment debate. Lucy: it’s going to happen anyway, the 1000, so do it right now.

 Kate: it’s a lot of money, we don’t have it.

 Miriam: Grant only over summer

 Kate: What about fresher’s week.

General escalation, we are finding ourselves in some serious financial trouble seeing ball/freshers week etc.

Return to debate on amendment:
Ed: We haven’t passed fresher’s week. It’s £3000, we can’t afford fresher’s week then. Jamie: We don’t want to have the ball committee work from 500 pounds, that’s impossible.
Sandy: How much oft he 3000 we get back?
Graham: max. £1450.
Kate. There’s also t-shirts, which are expensive.

Paul: why hostile?
Pete: these are the numbers we will need. Droppoing down to 500 is a significant decrease, which we can’t easily deal with. Intitial impetus is important.
Kate: What’s the marketing budget?
Molly: goes into detail of how the money will be spent, not onyl on marketing. It’s basically impossible to pay any deposits with a budget of 500
Move to vote on amendment to change to 500. No-one in favour.

Back to motion:

Lucy: Can in amend this in regard to the 2000?
Kate: I read it as a reduction to saving a grant, sneaking somethign past the JCR.

Molly: It’s the opposite. We want the JCR to know that we’re expecting 2000 anway.

Paul: If we vote this through + pass freshers week budget and say we’re not giving £2000, can we then bring it in Michaelmas. Ed: No we can’t.

Jamie: Why don’t we give them money as and when they need it up to £1000 with 10% interest. Amendment taken as friendly.

Move to vote: The motion passes with overwhleming majority

1. Motions as submitted

Motion to pledge support for the OUSBMS campaign to make commoner’s gowns compulsory in viva exams.

This JCR notes:

* Viva exams are oral presentations in many science degrees which involves presenting a research project and answering questions from an examiner.
* It is currently compulsory for students to wear full subfusc with the appropriate gown.
* The examiner being aware of the student’s academic history has the potential to introduce unconscious bias. (I.e. a scholar may be asked harder questions or given the benefit of the doubt if near a grade boundary).
* All students buy a commoner’s gown for matriculation.
* Pledges of support from JCRs will be a show of solidarity, demonstrating that students value fairness in examinations.

This JCR believes:

* That unconscious bias should be minimised in viva exams.
* That students should be judged on performance in that exam, and not on previous academic history.

This JCR resolves:

* To pledge support for the OUSBMS campaign to make commoner’s gowns compulsory in vivas.

Proposed: Milo Fabian
Seconded: Ben Thorne

SFQ:
Josh: is this for all subject.
Jemimah: it will be expanded.

Debate: None
Motion passes with overwhelming majority.

International Freshers Motion

The JCR Notes:

1. That international undergraduate freshers are not allowed to arrive in Michaelmas Term until Saturday of 0th week.
2. The University’s International Orientation takes place in -1st week of term (a week before 0th week) for graduate students, but on Monday 0th week for undergraduates. This is due to be shorter from 2016 with more material moved online, but this can still cause clashes leading to international freshers missing out on other events.
3. Linked to this problem is a lack of flexibility with respect to when all students can arrive and leave, often on a presumption that a student’s parents can bring their belongings on a certain day.
4. Some international freshers tend to arrive in the UK prior to when they are allowed to move in to allow themselves more time to settle in, but are forced to stay outside of their college.
5. In addition to the challenges UK freshers face in settling into Oxford, international freshers also deal with culture shock, jet lag and living thousands of miles away from home- and need Freshers’ Week to do tasks such as setting up a UK bank account and getting a phone contract.

The JCR Believes:

1. It makes the overall process of settling in at Oxford much more difficult if international students arrive at the same time as UK students, rather than having several days to get used to the UK.
2. The busy schedule of Freshers’ Week often does not build in time for issues like culture shock or setting up bank accounts, and so international students need additional days to settle in.
3. The college should prioritise the welfare of students, but particularly international freshers, over other potential uses of accommodation in 0th week and the week before this.

The JCR Resolves:

1. To support the campaign to allow international freshers to arrive in college on the Thursday of -1st week if they want or need to and for the college to be more flexible in departure and arrival dates before/after the vacation.
2. To mandate the International Officer of the college to bring this issue up with the college Domestic Bursar before the end of Trinity Term 2016.
3. To support the International Officer in holding events for international freshers in -1st week and 0th week to help them get to know each other, to walk them them through specific tasks such as setting up a bank account and to offer advice/workshops on international-welfare related issues such as culture shock.

Proposed: Hannah Cheah

Seconded: Jennifer Chen

SFQ: None.

Milo: Does it say anything about accommodation?
Hannah: Prioritising International students’ welfare over college guests/conferences.

Debate: None.
No opposition. Motion passes.

The JCR’s position on the chancellor’s position

This JCR notes:

1. *The Telegraph*’s report that “Universities cannot accept more ethnic minority students without eroding standards, the chancellor of Oxford University has warned” and their subsequent clarification that “Lord Patten was talking about quotas in relation to the erosion of standards, not to the presence of ethnic minority students per se.”
2. The Chancellor Lord Patten’s statement, quoted in *The Telegraph*: “I don’t think that if you want high class universities you should expect them to lower their standards in order to make up for some inadequacies in our secondary education system.”
3. The 2014-15 Equality Report, which found that
	1. 13% of undergraduates at Oxford identified themselves as BME in 2014, compared to an average of 18% for Russell Group universities;
	2. black students were under-represented at Oxford;
	3. “[i]n the undergraduate admissions cycle for entry in 2014, 19% of UK-domiciled applicants were BME, 14% of offer-holders and 13% of acceptances”;
	4. there is an ethnicity gap in finals at Oxford of 5% (although this is smaller than at other Russell Group universities).
4. The annual report from the Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission which
	1. found that Oxford “still recruit[s] a disproportionate number of students from private schools … To meet their benchmarks, Oxford would need to increase the percentage of state school pupils by a quarter” (p.94)
	2. found that “analysis shows that even after taking into account differences in A level performance, unexplained gaps in access between advantaged and disadvantaged groups remain.” (p.94)
	3. welcomed the introduction of contextual measures as a means of “addressing the under-representation of lower-income and state-educated students.” (p.95)
5. That multiple investigations have found that state-educated students tend to do better than privately educated students with similar results at school once at university.

This JCR believes:

1. That BME students and state-educated students from lower socio-economic backgrounds are not being shown the respect they eminently deserve from the Chancellor.
2. That increasing the proportion of state-schooled students and BME students at the University of Oxford would not by any means amount to an erosion of standards.
3. That the Chancellor’s comments as described in notes (1)
	1. are reprehensible insofar as they rely on the assumption that deliberately increasing the proportion of aforementioned students at Oxford via quotas would entail a lowering of standards, since it is clear that many highly capable students are turned away from Oxford every year, and that they are disproportionately rejected;
	2. reveal a lack of understanding of how ethnicity and class intersect, and how both of these affect students in secondary education, in the university application process and while studying at the University of Oxford;
	3. demonstrate an insufficient concern for the findings of the Equality Report 2014-15 that demonstrate that BME students still have a worse experience the University of Oxford compared to their white peers and that the institution has still not succeeded in eradicating the ethnicity gap at finals;
	4. are therefore unacceptable from a representative of the University of Oxford.
4. That the Chancellor’s comments as quoted in notes (2) are a direct contradiction of the University of Oxford’s commitment to widening access, since shifting the responsibility of promoting equality of opportunity onto the secondary education system is in marked opposition to the spirit of access as practiced by the University of Oxford.
5. That the University ought to be striving to eradicate the ethnicity gap at finals and otherwise ensuring that the experiences of BME students are not worse than those of white students.

This JCR resolves to:

1. Condemn the Chancellor’s comments as described in notes (1) and (2), and express this condemnation in the open letter.
2. Demand a full and public apology from Lord Patten, as well as a demonstration of his commitment to access and anti-racism.

Proposed: Alice Rubbra
Seconded: Ioan Philipps

SFQ:
Josh: I’ve already read the letter with your name on it. What about that?
Jemimah: currently it’s only me personally, not the JCR.

Debate:
Sandy (after Ed pointing this out): Amendment to put in the policy document the resolves clauses.
Taken as friendly
Josh: What are we adding to the policy document? General condemnation of Lord Patten?
Alice: It’s not only about condemning him, but asking to be less ignorant and asking him to be factually correct in regards of access and admissions quesitons.
Paul: He doesn’t have a clue what he’s doing.
Jemimah: How do you mean?
Paul: I don’t know, I just don’t like him.

No opposition. The motion passes unanimously.

Sources: (need to tidy this up)

The University of Oxford’s Equality Report for 2014/15

Social Mobility and Child Poverty annual report 2015: <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/485926/State_of_the_nation_2015__social_mobility_and_child_poverty_in_Great_Britain.pdf>

State school students do better: http://www.theguardian.com/education/2013/jun/16/accesstouniversity-private-schools

1. Emergency Motions

Creation of an Access and Outreach Committee

This JCR believes:

1. that the JCR has a responsibility to represent the college in access and outreach work.
2. that the JCR needs to become more involved in outreach projects outside of college.

This JCR notes:

that there is no collective student body under the JCR that focuses on outreach work outside of the college.

This JCR resolves:

1. To mandate the Access and Admissions Officer to create an informal committee for Access and Admissions of which any JCR member or person otherwise appointed by the Access Officer can be a member;
2. To mandate the Access Officer – by inclusion of this in the standing orders - to hold informal meetings with the Access Committee when they deem appropriate;
3. To mandate the Access Officer to explore with this committee opportunities for outreach work outside of college, such as IntoUniversity Oxford South East.

Proposed: Alice Rubbra

Seconded: Hannah Cheah

SFQ:
Lucy: Would they be elected and how many?
Alice: They’d be appointed, a body outside the constitution, not sure yet how many. Just about putting it in the standing orders. At the moment, I don’t do anything with Access outside of Corpus, I want to make the role involve this, too.

Debate:
Ed: Can you change the resolves so that we don’t create a JCR body? Committee in the formal sense is an issue. Amendment to change to ‘create an informal committee’ Taken as friendly..
Ed: And Resolves 2) needs to be added to the standing order.
Taken as friendly

Kate: what about the Entz Pres precedent, whereby such an informal committee could be formed from those also running for the position.
Graham: Featuring a great pun on precedent and president, he suggest that they’re might be an issue, because no-one will be on there.

Ed: Can’t this just be common practice?
Alice: Yes sure.

Paul: Can we invite Lord Patten to this?
Alice: The committee could genuinely be looking after issues like this. Samina Khan has been invited previously, who is fantastic.

No opposition. The motion passes unanimously.

1. Any other Business