

# JCR Meeting Minutes – Sunday 6<sup>th</sup> week TT09

**Chair:** Preeti Dhillon (JCR President)

**Secretary:** Nikki Hutchison (JCR VP)

**JCR Officers Present:** Tom Barker (Treasurer); Lisa Blundell (Equal Opps); Katie Johnston (RO); Jeremy Lloyd (Charities/RAG); Alex Gee (Computing); Meera Desai (Welfare, Female); Adam Salt (Welfare, Male); Katie Doig (Tortoise Keeper and Cinema Curator); Jane Sancinito (International students); Katie Bayliss (Libraries and Academic); David Giles (OUSU); Naomi Ofori (Entz President); Ned Gramich (Domestic); Poet Laureate (Ces Omissi).

MEETING STARTS: 7.43PM

## Summary of Actions:

Resolves:

- To create an Equal Opportunities committee, which would consist of the Equal Opportunities Officer, the two Welfare Officers, the Admissions and Access Officer and non-committee reps to represent minority groups within the JCR: LGBTQ, Gender, BME (Black Minority and Ethnic), Disabilities; to change the Constitution and Standing Orders accordingly; and to mandate the Equal Ops officer to review the new system at the end of Michaelmas Term 09.
- To Mandate the VP to create a new JCR Banner, ready for Michaelmas Term, which will be then used at events like JCR photos, and to taken to events for causes which JCR Members support and care about.
- To mandate the JCR treasurer to transfer the JCR account from RBS to the Cooperative bank, pending college approval.

Money:

- To divide the RAG fund for Trinity term 2009 equally between six causes: BK LUWO, Stonewall UK, Schola Cantorum of Oxford, Great Ormond Street Children's Hospital (nominated by the JCR), and The Aqualung Trust, and Action Aid (nominated by the Charities Officer).
- To give Katie and Ned £40 for the buying of a Digibox for the JCR TV.
- To reimburse Nikki accordingly for making the new JCR Banner (up to £80).
- To reimburse Ned Gramich for the decorations for the Carnival Formal Hall, which cost around £18

## Preliminary Business

Summary of actions from the last meeting are read.

Preeti notes that the OUSU Motion regarding OUSUs stance on Lifting the Cap on Tuition Fees/a Graduate Tax, on which The President, OUSU Officer and 3<sup>rd</sup> Vote were mandated to vote 1 for, 1 against and 1 abstain in the 2<sup>nd</sup> week JCR Meeting, passed at OUSU Council on Friday (i.e. OUSUs stance is to keep the current cap on Tuition Fees, but have a graduate Tax. This is what they'll take to NUS.)

The Ball Committee have been elected.

**Procedural Motion:** Jeremy Lloyd asks to move his motion forward, so it's the first one to be read. No objections.

## 6. Charities for this term

### **This JCR notes that:**

1. The charities officer requested charities nominations from the JCR
2. The charities officer recieved only four nominations, which were: BK LUWO, Stonewall UK, Schola Cantorum of Oxford, Great Ormond Street Children's Hospital

### **This JCR believes that:**

1. The charities officer has the right to nominate causes at his discretion if too few causes have been nominated by the JCR.

### **This JCR resolves to**

1. Divide the RAG fund for Trinity term 2009 equally between six causes: the four above mentioned charities nominated by the JCR, and the two charities nominated by the charities officer (The Aqualung Trust, and Action Aid).

Proposed: Jeremy Lloyd

Seconded: Naomi Ofori

### **SFQs**

Katie Johnston asks what do the Charities do? Jeremy Lloyd explains. [Secretary believes interested parties can look this information up on the internet.]

**No opposition, Motion Passes.**

## 1. The introduction of an Equal Opportunities committee [*second reading*]

(The Motion:

The proposed solution is to create an Equal Opportunities committee, which would consist of the Equal Opportunities Officer, the two Welfare Officers, the Admissions and Access Officer and **reps to represent minority groups** within the JCR. We are proposing the introduction of four permanent reps:

**LGBTQ rep**

**Gender rep**

**BME (Black Minority and Ethnic) rep**

**Disabilities rep.**

The introduction of such a committee would involve a rearrangement of some of the JCR committee positions and duties.)

**This JCR notes:**

1. That current provision for minorities in college is provided by the LGBT Officer and the Equal Opportunities Officer, who both sit on JCR Committee
2. That there is currently no similar specific provision for students from other minority groups such as BME students or students with disabilities

**This JCR believes:**

1. That the JCR should be, and is, committed to providing support and representation for all students in college.
2. That having a nominated individual with responsibility for the interests of a particular group will lead to more balanced and effective representation and support for that group.

**This JCR resolves:**

1. To amend the JCR Constitution so that the Sub-clause (iii) of Clause 27– Timing (*The position of the LGBT Officer shall be an elected post, voted for by all members of the JCR. If no candidate is elected for the post, it shall be taken by either of the JCR Welfare Officers*) is changed to **“The Equal Opportunity Officers shall be elected posts, voted for by all members of the JCR. If no candidate is elected for the post, it shall be filled, by default, by either the Equal Opportunity Officer or the JCR Welfare Officers.”**
2. To amend the JCR Constitution so that the words *“apart from those circumstances outlined by clause 28 (iii) above”* are removed from Clause 30 – Eligibility, Sub-clause (iv).
3. To amend the JCR Constitution so that the words *“the LGBT Officer,”* are removed from the list of JCR Committee members in Clause 2 - JCR Committee and Officers, Sub-clause (i).
4. To amend the JCR Constitution so that the words *“LGBT Officer,”* are replaced with **“Equal Opportunities Committee representatives”** from the list of positions to be elected in Trinity term in Clause 27 - Timing, Sub-clause (ii).
5. To add the following to (the relevant section) in the JCR Constitution:

*“The Equal Opportunities Committee.*

*i) The Equal Opportunities Committee shall be led by the Equal Opportunities Officer and shall meet informally at least twice per term.*

*ii) The Welfare Officer (Male), Welfare Officer (Female) and the Admissions and Access Officer shall be members.*

*iii) There shall be Representative members of the Committee to represent minority groups within the JCR. There will be four permanent positions: LGBTQ rep, BME rep, Disabilities rep and Gender rep.*

*iv) New representative members of the Equal Opportunities Committee can be added by the normal constitutional change process.*

*v) Representative members shall be elected by members of the JCR in the following manner:*

*a) Each post shall be elected within one week of its creation or at the resignation of an incumbent officer, and in each subsequent Trinity Term.*

*b) The Equal Opportunities Officer shall call elections in accordance with (a), giving at least 96 hours notice.*

*c) Nominations shall be accepted by the Equal Opportunities Officer up to 48 hours before the election is due to take place.*

*d) The Equal Opportunities Officer shall publish the list of candidates at least 24 hours in advance of the election*

*e) Any posts with only one candidate shall be elected immediately.*

- f) . The elections shall take place on paper alongside the other 7<sup>th</sup> week elections.
- g) Members of the JCR may vote in person or in proxy.
- i) Any member of the JCR may request a secret ballot.
- j) The Committee shall be responsible for the provision of welfare and representation particular to all minority groups within the JCR. Each Representative member shall have a mandate to lead the provision for the group that they represent, at the instruction of the Committee. This may include organising social events, making available relevant information and attending relevant OUSU meetings.
- k) The Committee shall stay within financial limits set by the JCR."

6. To make the following changes to the standing orders for the Equal Opportunities Officer:

i) to add:

*"vii) To lead the Equal Opportunities Committee with the aim of carrying out these tasks.*

*viii) To publicise each term the potential for individuals within college to take up these positions."*

ii) To add "Equal Opportunities Committee" to the committees to be attended by: Equal Opportunities Officer, both Welfare Officers and Admissions and Access Officer.

iii) To add "College Welfare Committee" (Welfare lunch) to the committees to be attended by the Equal Opportunities officer.

7. To make the following changes to the standing orders for the LGBT Officer, which would then subsequently become the standing order for the LGBTQ Rep:

- i) to change i) to *"to provide a focal point for student welfare in college, with a particular emphasis on LGBT issues, and act as a signpost to LGBT related welfare services in college, in the university and more broadly."*
- ii) To replace "JCR committee" with "Equal Opportunities Committee" on the committees to be attended by the LGBT rep
- iii) To change v) to *"to liaise with all other Equal Opportunities Committee Members, convening a meeting at least twice a term, so as to co-ordinate activities and better serve undergraduate members"*

8. To create the following standing orders:

#### **BME Rep**

Elected: Trinity

Term of Office: One year

Committees: Equal Opportunities Committee

Duties:

- 1. to provide a focal point for student welfare in college, with a particular emphasis on BME issues, and act as a signpost to BME related welfare services in college, in the university and more broadly
- 2. to publish in College all BME welfare-related information from College/University/OUSU/NUS/CRAE campaign via the welfare board, JCR cupboard and JCR welfare website
- 3. to liaise with OUSU in connection with its BME welfare services, including attendance at any OUSU BME-focused welfare groups
- 4. to liaise with the appropriate university societies, distributing any related information about entz or welfare
- 5. to liaise with all other Equal Opportunities Committee Members, attending a meeting at least twice a term, so as to co-ordinate activities and better serve undergraduate members

#### **Disabilities Rep**

Elected: Trinity

Term of Office: One year

Committees: Equal Opportunities Committee

Duties:

1. to provide a focal point for student welfare in college, with a particular emphasis on issues for disabled students, and act as a signpost to welfare services in college, in the university and more broadly available for disabled students.
2. to publish in College all welfare-related information for disabled students from College/University/OUSU/NUS via the welfare board, JCR cupboard and JCR welfare website
3. to liaise with OUSU in connection with its welfare services for disabled students, including attendance at any OUSU welfare groups that discuss issues facing disabled students
4. to liaise with all other Equal Opportunities Committee Members, attending a meeting at least twice a term, so as to co-ordinate activities and better serve undergraduate members.

### **Gender Rep**

Elected: Trinity

Term of Office: One year

Committees: Equal Opportunities Committee

Duties:

1. to provide a focal point for student welfare in college, with a particular emphasis on gender issues, and act as a signpost to gender related welfare services in college, in the university and more broadly
  2. to publish in College all gender welfare-related information from College/University/OUSU/NUS via the welfare board, JCR cupboard and JCR welfare website
  3. to liaise with OUSU in connection with its gender welfare services, including attendance at any OUSU gender-focused welfare groups
  4. to liaise with the appropriate university society, distributing any related information about entz or welfare
  5. to liaise with all other Equal Opportunities Committee Members, attending a meeting at least twice a term, so as to co-ordinate activities and better serve undergraduate members
- 
9. To let the LGBT Officer elected at the forthcoming (Trinity) elections hold office under the system detailed above as a Representative Member of the Equal Opportunities Committee for LGBT.
  10. To Mandate the Equal Ops officer to bring a general report to the JCR on how the subcommittee is working, the meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> week MT09.

Proposed: Lisa Blundell

Seconded: Katie Johnston

### **SFQs**

Dave Nickerson asks who votes for these positions. Katie Johnston answers anyone can vote for them.

Rhiannon Ward asks if any of the SCR have been consulted. Lisa B answers yes they have, at Welfare Lunch. [Secretary Notes: see previous Meeting minutes for an explanation of Welfare Lunch.] Adam H says that Judith Maltby [Tutor for Welfare and Chaplain of Corpus Chapel] has told him she was concerned about this motion, and asked in response to being told about it if there was an issue of homophobia in college. Lisa B responded that she has not had this repose from Judith when talking to her about it.

Jane Sancinito asks when the last time we didn't fill an officer's role? Katie Bayliss answers (in the last two years): Computing, RO...

### **POD**

Adam Hadley feels that although this motion was discussed in the previous meeting, there are still issues to discuss and it should be debated again. His objections: the motion is not well thought out; it's unnecessary; and it's dangerous to demote the LGBTQ officer. He thinks a better and sensible way is to have all the proposed roles on the *JCR* committee.

Lisa Blundell says that one of the most important things about the motion is the creation of the new Equal Ops committee. Adam H believes positions will have less clout when not on the JCR committee. Jeremy Lloyd says that being a separate committee role does give you any less clout; for example he is on one at the English faculty, where they discuss specific matters and then pass what they'd concluded up to a higher level; it's how institutions work. Adam H says the great thing about Corpus is that it's small and friendly; it's not parliament or the English faculty; the best place to deal with issue *is* JCR Committee meetings. Katie J says although the creation of the new committee was important, the main reason for the motion was better representation. The JCR Committee meets for ½ an hour before JCR Meetings; it's not the forum to discuss sensitive issues that specific people may have brought to JCR Officers. Adam H asks why can't the new officers meet separately anyway and discuss these issues and then bring them to the JCR Committee Meetings? Katie J says that moving the LGBTQ officer to a separate committee isn't a huge step. The inherent value in this motion is in having a specific, formal committee devoted to these issues. Joe Fallon asks why can't the new officers simply be on both committees. Who will represent them at JCR Committee meetings? Katie J answers that they'll be represented by the Equal Ops officer. Joe Fallon argues that then it becomes too complex; these officers reporting to Equal Ops who reports to Committee, the reports back etc... James Pontifex says the objections to downgrading the LGBT officer are reducing representation. You could equally take Female and Male Welfare Officers off the committee, and have them report to one Committee officer. Katie J says that it helps for the Equal Ops officer to be able to summarise what has gone on in the Equal Ops committee.

Dave N doesn't have a problem with motion per se; he wants to know what happens if no one runs for the posts? Also, why should he as a disabled student care who non-disabled students want for a rep [i.e. why isn't it just the specific minority who votes for their representative]? Lisa B responds firstly that they don't want to single people out in college and they that because they belong to the minority they have to vote, and secondly that there doesn't seem to be a problem with getting people to want to run for these roles (she has spoken to several people who are interest in these prospective officer roles). Dave N answers that all he really wants from his disabled students' rep is for them to point him the direction of University Wide provision. Lisa B says that the new roles will do this; but also that one of the most important parts of these new roles is access for new students: prospective students will look at the JCR website and see that their minority is being represented. Dave N responds that this will hardly look good if they are listed next to 'tortoise keeper'; it won't look like we care. Lisa B says that they'll be listed under 'Equal Ops committee, making it look as though we care a lot. Adam S points out that even with the best will in the world, one officer can't go to all the OUSU committee for all the minorities. Katie J says that the roles can also deal with specific issues of discrimination.

Jeremy L says that just because a role in non-committee doesn't make it less important; environment and ethics, charities, careers, computing are all non-committee roles. All he need to do (in his role as Charities/RAG Officer) he can do in his own time; and if he does have something specific he wants to raise at a JCR Committee Meeting he can ask Preeti if he and come along. Adam H says that they are fortunate to have a fairly liberal President (in Preeti) currently; this could change in the future, especially if they have some sort of agenda, and the non-committee members could be sidelined. Katie J thinks non-committee members can come along to any Committee meeting if they want to; Joe F thinks (constitutionally) they need an invitation.

Katie Bayliss says it's easy enough for officers, if they're dedicated, to arrange to meet between themselves.

Rhiannon W says that there seem to be 2 parts of debate. Firstly people want there to be a formalised Equal Ops committee, with these new roles. Secondly that people are concerned about having these new roles as non-committee. She proposes a compromise, in the form of an amendment:

**Amendment proposed** [Secretary notes: at this point in the meeting Rhiannon W carefully went through the motion and proposed amendments to all the relevant parts that changed the following things:]

1. Having all the proposed new officers on the JCR Committee, as well as the proposed Equal Ops committee;
2. No longer taking LGBTQ off the JCR Committee;
3. The officers would be elected with continuity, i.e. 3 in Michaelmas and 2 in Trinity, and in the normal way (by an election called by the RO, not the Equal Ops officer) ,

4. To have the new officers on the College Welfare Committee;
5. To change the proposed review to the end of Hilary.

[Secretary continues to note: I have not noted down exactly what the amendments were or what the amended motion might look like, as the amendment did not subsequently pass and I feel it doesn't lend well to clarity.]

Ruth Simister asks what the role of the Equal Ops officer would be then. Rhiannon W replied that they would deal with any issue not covered by the proposed new roles, and they would chair the Equal Ops committee meetings, and handle the proposed review. Jeremy L asks why she is keeping the Equal Ops committee. Rhiannon replies that at the last meeting, people seemed to want the Equal Ops committee.

**Speech for Amendment:** Rhiannon Ward says she is proposing a compromise: keeping the new committee and adding more representation, but addressing the concerns of those who don't want the LGBTQ officer downgraded.

**Speech Against:** Katie J says she would rather have this than no motion at all, but thinks you should vote against it as it makes the JCR Committee too big; having the roles on the JCR Committee might well discourage people from applying, as it gives them more work.

[Secretary notes: There was a challenge to the factuality of one of the statements made in the Speech Against; Katie J conceded it to be removed from the Speech Against. It does not appear here.]

**For:** 9

**Against:** 20

**Abstaining:** 2

**Amendment fails. Meeting reverts to debating the motion.**

Adam H expressed that he thinks this is sad, and that Rhiannon tried very hard to suggest a compromise.

**MTV**

**Opposed**

**Speech in Favour:** Meera D says that we've already had one meeting over this; we've tried to amend it and failed; we could be here for hours debating it back and forth.

**Speech Against:** Joe Fallon says that there are still people with their hands up who wish to speak – we may as well talk about this for a little while longer, surely?

**For:** 11

**Against:** 12

**Abstain:** 5

**MTV Fails. Meeting reverts to debating the motion.**

Adam H suggests tabling the motion until 8<sup>th</sup> week, so Finalist currently unable to come to a motion would be able to. Their votes and opinions should not matter simply because they aren't going to be here next year. Naomi Ofori responds that JCR meetings are never properly representative – you can't just say it's unrepresentative because the people you want to be here aren't. Lisa B points out first years will have exams in 8<sup>th</sup> week. Jeremy L thinks if people really cared they would be here. This college is apathetic, and that's a shame, but the people who care are here. Ed Brown thinks that this isn't an issue of age/year group; if it was tabling the motion to wait for finalist would make sense, e.g. if we were raising

the rent just for 2nd years, but this issue isn't specific to year group. Dave N says that if there is such mass apathy why bother doing anything, and leaves.

Katie B suggests having a referendum, to gain better representation – of all years, not just finalists. Matt Ryder thinks that those who don't turn up to a meeting won't vote either. Joe F agrees (with Katie B): if there's a referendum, that will be it, the final say. Adam S asks if 3<sup>rd</sup> years really are very much against this motion. Adam H doesn't know – he's been busy revising for finals – Rhiannon Ward says she knows there is; she's overheard conversations in the library, and thinks MCR members are also opposed. She says that 3<sup>rd</sup> years have been here for a long time, and they've seen college life; just because they won't be here next year doesn't mean they don't know what they're on about, and shouldn't be listened to. [Secretary notes for explanatory purposes: it is difficult to tell merely from the minutes, as year groups aren't noted down, but the feel in the meeting is that the majority of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> years – by no means exclusive – in the meeting are for the motion, and the majority of third years are against it.]

Katie J says that firstly having a referendum sets a bad precedent for future meetings – anytime someone wants another bite of the apple on having their way they can ask for a referendum, using this meeting as a precedent – and secondly she thinks this is all the referendum is being used for here: another bite of the apple. Ed Brown thinks that it's bad there aren't many 3<sup>rd</sup> years present, and that the JCR is fairly apathetic about this (as not many are here); but he can't see, as he said before, why this affects 3<sup>rd</sup> years more than any other year group. He also agrees with Katie J about it being a bad precedent. Katie B clarifies that it's not just about 3<sup>rd</sup> years: there might be people who this really affects, such as those with disabilities which mean they can't be here/ are too shy to be here. Everyone can vote online, even with finals or an essay crisis. They can find out about the issue from meeting minutes.

Rhiannon ward **proposes an amendment**: that the motion be tabled until 8<sup>th</sup> week, and that there be a referendum tagged onto the end of the JCR Elections (running in 7<sup>th</sup> week).

**Speech For:** Rhiannon Ward says that for the sake of all finalist, those who are shy, etc... the only way to get everyone in college to have an equal vote is by referendum, this is a massive constitutional change; it ought to be voted by all.

**Speech Against:** Katie J says that this is a bad precedent; that when similar motions have been discussed before, no referendum has been suggested; and that in a complicated motion such as this people need to have it explained to them and have listen to the debate, or they will just tick a box without thinking.

**For:** 9

**Against:** 21

**Abstained:** 1

**Amendment fails. Meeting reverts to debating the motion.**

Adam H says he is disgusted that a referendum has been rejected, that this is not good democracy, and suggest that all opposing the motion should walk out of the meeting so that quorum will be broken. Many leave [Secretary estimates roughly 8]; Rhiannon W wished it to be minuted that she left. JCR members present are counted. Quorum is indeed broken.

[Secretary notes: quorum is the number of votes required for the JCR to constitutionally be able to vote on something; i.e. without 25 JCR members present, we can't vote on stuff.]

Matt Ryder suggests that everyone call people they know so quorum can be met again; he thinks that people walking out and the speech preceding them doing so was patronising and very undemocratic.

Within about 7 minutes people are found and quorum is reached again.

**MTV**



**For: 23**

**Against: 1**

**Abstained: 1**

**Motion passes.**

There is disruption in the meeting for a few minutes; then most of those who walked out return to the meeting.

## 2. JCR banking – switching our account to a more ethical Bank

**This JCR notes:**

1. the co-operative bank invests ethically,
2. RBS does not invest ethically,
3. the JCR currently banks with RBS.

**This JCR believes:**

1. in ethical investment.

**This JCR Resolves:**

1. to mandate the JCR treasurer to transfer the JCR account from RBS to the co-operative bank, pending college approval.

Proposed: Thomas Barker (JCR Treasurer)

Seconded: Nikki Hutchison

### **SFQs**

Naomi Ofori asks if we've done a motion for this previously. Tom B says we haven't.

Cez Omisi asks what RBS invest in. Ruth S responds they invest in the arms trade, amongst other things.

Joe F asks if Tom B has got College permission for this. Tom B says no, he decided to bring it to the JCR first as it would be quicker to get it through one the JCR has given the all clear. Plus, if the college says no, we can't do it full stop, so it doesn't matter what order he consults College and JCR in.

Katie B thinks calling one bank more ethical is debatable. Ruth S responds that the Co-op Bank has an ethical policy that it's members can vote on; this included a policy against investing the arms trade, or in Fossil Fuel extraction. Katie B says FFE isn't necessarily a bad thing; Ruth S responds more about the evils of RBS – for example they invest in a quarrying method that produces 50% more CO<sub>2</sub> than normal; that RBS produces more than twenty times the CO<sub>2</sub> that Scotland did in 2007... she concedes we could debate the climate change, but that's a separate issue, and would be useless. Plus, they invest in the arms trade, which most can agree is pretty bad.

Katie Doig asks if there is a Co-op Bank branch in Oxford. Tom B replies that there is.

**MTV**

## **Joe Fallon Opposes**

Speech For: Katie J says we need to go home

Speech against: Joe F says why not oppose it

## **Vote for MTV is overwhelming. MTV**

**For:** 26

**Against:** 4

**Abstain:** 4

## **Motion Passes**

**Procedural Motion:** Katie D asks for her motion to be brought forward, so she can leave. No objections.

## **4. A Digibox!**

### **The JCR notes that:**

1. The TV in the Big TV Room has very bad reception. Most of the programmes (apart from ITV for some reason) are either fuzzy or in black and white.
2. That this impinges on our enjoyment of telly watching, especially when such important programmes such as University Challenge or The apprentice are on.
3. That TVs everywhere will soon be running only through digital, and that the telly is currently an analogue one.

### **This JCR resolves:**

1. To give Katie and Ned £40 for the buying of a Digibox for the JCR TV.

Proposed: Ned Gramich

Seconded: Katie Doig

## **SFQs**

David Giles asks why now, as we don't go Digital until 2011. Ned Gramich is confused by this; it is explained to her that it's a region by region switch, and she realises that it is Wales that switches this year... {Secretary notes: Ned is Welsh.} But it's pointed out that we'll still need a Digibox at some point.

Ricky G asks will the box work, as you still need reception, and ours is dodgy anyway. Katie says they will buy a box, trial it, and then deal with fixing the problem of the aerial if there is one.

**No opposition. Motion passes.**

## **3. A New Corpus Banner**

### **This JCR Notes:**

1. Corpus JCR used to have a banner (see previous JCR photos, and references to it in the JCR Policy Document).

### **This JCR Believes:**

1. Banners are cool, and also make JCR Photos look good. They can also be used at events like the tortoise fair, summer eights, or open/interview days, etc.
2. That though JCR Members care passionately about many important things (like Making Poverty History), we lead very busy lives, so usually cannot go to rallies en masse to show our corporate support
3. That we should be able never the less to show such support at such events
4. A Banner can be easily taken to rallies etc by one or two of our number.

### **This JCR Resolves:**

1. To mandate Nikki to make a new and smashing banner, ready for Michaelmas, and reimburse her accordingly (up to £80).
2. To use this banner on JCR photos, and to take to events for causes which JCR Members support and care about.

Proposed: Nikki Hutchison - VP and Guerrilla knitting Guru

Seconded: Jane Sancinito – Seamstress extraordinaire

### **SFQs**

David G asks if there is any reference to a banner in the constitution. Nikki H replies no, but it is mentioned in the Policy Document, which is *well* out of date, but in future could be updated to read 'This JCR supports such-and-such a cause, and allows it's banner to be carried at rallied to support said cause'.

In light of this, David G **proposes an amendment** from 'Corpuscles' to 'JCR members' so, to stick to the correct (Constitution- and Policy Document-style wording.

### **Accepted as friendly.**

Cez O wishes to have some specific deals about this banner. [A Banner-Making Committee is suggested - not entirely seriously...] Nikki H says those who have suggestions for what the banner should look like are welcome to approach her or e-mail her, and she'll take those into account. Cez O agrees to do this. It is also asked how big the banner might be. Nikki H says that ideally small enough to go on the JCR photo without dwarfing its members, but large enough to be seen at rallies etc. She says, if there is no objection, she will use her own judgement on this.

**No objection. Motion passes.**

## **5. Carnival Formal Hall Decorations**

### **This JCR believes:**

1. That themed formal halls are fun and that we should have more of them.

### **This JCR notes:**

1. That Ned Gramich paid for the decorations for the Carnival Formal Hall.

### **This JCR resolves:**

1. To reimburse Ned Gramich for the decorations, which cost around £18.

Proposed: Lisa Blundell  
Seconded: Ned Gramich

### **SFQs**

Joe F asks, as decorations have been purchased for Formal Hall before, if a regular allowance for this could be made in the Budget. Preeti D says the proposers did not in fact need to bring the motion, as they could indeed have just asked the Treasurer.

**No objection. Motion Passes.**

Meeting finishes at roughly 9.50pm