

MINUTES OF AN ORDINARY JCR MEETING

Sunday 6th Week MT11

Chair: Jack Evans (JCR President)

Secretary: Samuel Robberts (JCR Vice President)

JCR Members present: c.35

13th November 2011

20.04 – 21.07

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Present:

Jack Evans (JCR President)

Sam Robberts (VP)

Alex Franklin (JCR Treasurer)

Access Officer- Mek Mesfin

Accommodation Officer – Livvy Elder

Clubs and Societies- Dom McGovern

Domestic and Careers Officer – Eddie Lundy

Environment and Ethics- Imogen Jones

Equal Opps President – Olivia Chinwokwu

International Student Officer – Jan Willem Scholten

OUSU Officer- Johnny Earl

Welfare Officer (Male) - Mike Hardy

Entz President- Millie Ismail

Welfare Officer (Female) - Jessica Lewis

Arts Officer- Alex Coupe

Apologies:

RAG Officer- Emma FR

Academic Affairs Officer- Megan McCullagh

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

Reading from the Poet Laureate is not forthcoming. Livvy Elder offers her husbands apologies, as he was in London and forgot. Jack suggests that he received the following as a poem:

Art?

Minutes of the last JCR meeting from 4th week, Michaelmas Term 2011, signed off. Ales Franklin notes that Samuel Robberts writes very good minutes. This results in a spontaneous round of applause for their general quality.

Jack explains that there are currently many different elections going on in the university, including OUSU ones. He asks Jacob if he has broken any rules – Jacob says he hasn't, to everyone's relief.

Jack explains that the Charities which were to be decided upon at this JCR meeting will be decided on Friday of 6th Week, at JCR tea. Gareth Langley says that he cannot make this meeting, but will do a pitch by proxy or email. Sophie Cass enquires whether we are deciding long or short term charities. We are to decide both.

Officer's reports –

None of the officers has anything to report.

Alex Franklin questions Eddie Lundy about his claims to have abolished boom and bust. Eddie dodges the questions, suggesting that he has the answers in his office.

Mike Hardy questions Eddie Lundy about his claims that the lollipops were the greatest form of social welfare ever seen in the JCR. Eddie says that, in terms of social welfare, they were. He does not explain what that means.

Corpus Christi JCR Policy Document

The JCR is to vote upon each affiliation and policy in order to keep it in the policy document

AFFILIATIONS

[📄 This JCR is affiliated to OUSU \(Oxford University Student Union\)](#)

Debate

1. Felipe opens the debate. He doesn't like OUSU.
2. Gareth Langley – Do we not have an annual referendum on OUSU membership?
3. Jack Evans – No, as we no longer pay we don't need one.
4. Rachel Dellar – The benefits outweigh problems, and OUSU does a lot of good things that we don't realise.
5. Sophie Cass – They run mi-vote, which is much better than a paper ballot
6. Jan Willem Scholten – He wants to end Martha McKenzie's emails

Move to a Vote

NO OPPOSITION TO THE POLICY

OUSU affiliation continued

Jacob Diggle tweets this news.

☑ **This JCR is affiliated to the NUS (National Union of Students), through affiliation to OUSU.**

Jan Willem Scholten raises opposition to NUS. However, we cannot be affiliated to OUSU without affiliating with NUS.

NUS affiliation Continued

☑ **This JCR is affiliated to the Making Poverty History Campaign.**

All in favour

Making Poverty History Campaign affiliation continued

☑ **This JCR is affiliated to the Oxford Living Wage Campaign.**

All in favour

Oxford Living Wage Campaign affiliation continued

POLICIES

Asylum

This JCR gives its full support to Azim Ansari and allows the carrying of the Corpus JCR banner at any supporting rallies for his concern.

Debate

1. Jack - Azim was a mature student in 2004, came over during Taliban and then deported back to Afghanistan. Don't know more – recommends the policy be dropped
2. People want to find out more – proposal that Jack and Millie will go to Afghanistan.
3. Imogen Jones – could we ask the SCR?

Move to a Vote

OVERWHELMING SUPPORT TO DROP THE POLICY

POLICY DROPPED FROM THE POLICY BOOK

Biomedical Research Facility

This JCR supports ~~the construction of~~ the Biomedical Research Facility at Oxford University and believes that the college and university should actively and openly support the same.

Debate Opens

1. **Amendment** – strike out the term ‘the construction of.’
Proposed Gareth Langley, Seconded Noah Evans Harding

Accepted as friendly

2. Dom McGovern– why just this institution when there are so many others?
3. Millie Ismail– personal reactions shouldn’t be the concern of the JCR. Animal testing is an individual personal issue.
4. Zack Hall – we should drop the whole thing, its pointless
5. Livvy Elder – when it was being built there was a lot of protest, with threats etc, so now our support is more ethical
6. Donal – ethical research group now defunct

Move to a Vote

Prop speech – Gareth – Important to discuss the issue

Con speech – Jan Willem – Outdated

Vote

For – 2

Against – Overwhelming

POLICY DROPPED

Browne Review

This JCR opposes the propositions of the Browne Review.

No Opposition

POLICY CONTINUED

Fairtrade

This JCR believes that:

☑ Global trade justice, involving decent wages, stable commercial relationships, workers freedom from violence and intimidation and respect for the local environment everywhere would be a good thing.

☑ The Fairtrade system of certification (as propagated by the Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International) and similarly rigorous alternatives are a positive step toward this.

☑ Wherever reasonably possible, the JCR should purchase fairly traded products, rather than non-fairly traded alternatives.

No Opposition

POLICY CONTINUED

Female Admissions

- ☑ This JCR would like to see female representation on all college bodies.
- ☑ This JCR supports the college's policy of having one woman interviewer present in every interview.
- ☑ This JCR believes college access work is good, but should take into account the current situation (as of MT05)

Debate

1. Alex Franklin– second point needs to be advertised. Encourages wider dissemination of information to students.
2. Anton Loning – is it just a woman in the room?
3. Mek Mesfin – why do we have this policy? – religious reasons, people feeling comfortable.
4. Livvy Elder - why not the reverse for men?
5. Mek Mesfin – the point of interview is to mimic a tutorial, so if there are only male tutors, then your comfort shouldn't trump their comfort
6. Rachel Dellar – mandate jack to talk to the SCR about it
7. Donal O'hara – strike it and then try again with the SCR.

Move to a Vote

Nobody in favour of the Policy continuing

MOTION DROPPED

Gender Inclusive Language

This JCR:

- ☑ Encourages members of the JCR to be as gender inclusive as possible in the language that they use.
- ☑ Encourages JCR officers to use gender inclusive language in emails.
- ☑ To make it clear that when the JCR runs gender specific events, anyone who identifies as that gender is able to and welcome to attend

No Opposition

POLICY CONTINUED

Make Poverty History

This JCR supports the "Make Poverty History" campaign.

No Opposition

POLICY CONTINUED

No Confidence in the Minister for Higher Education

This JCR supports the instruction to Council that this University has no confidence in the Minister for Higher Education, David Willets.

No Opposition

POLICY CONTINUED

Presidential Engagement

This JCR believes that the JCR President can, will and should get engaged during their term of office.

No Opposition

POLICY CONTINUED

Price of a Pint

This JCR believes that the cost of a pint in the Beer Cellar should be £2.00, regardless of alcohol duty.

No Opposition

POLICY CONTINUED

Regionally Adjusted Student Loans

This JCR supports the OUSU campaign for a regionally adjusted loan for Oxford-based students.

Debate

1. Jack - OUSU once had an idea of a regionally adjusted loans. Campaign no longer in existence.
2. **Amendment** - Strike 'the OUSU campaign for'.

Proposed Jess Lewis, Seconded Millie Ismail

Accepted as friendly

3. Mek – not a campaign anymore? We should drop the policy therefore.
4. Dellar – keep it so that ousu might remember.
5. Mek - respectable policy document is and up to date policy document
6. George simms- were Brookes involved?
7. Jack – I was doing my GCSE's when this happened. I don't know.

Move to a Vote

No body to propose the policy

MOTION DROPPED

Representation within college

This JCR believes that:

- ☑ Representatives of the JCR should be able to bring motions to Governing Body
- ☑ The JCR's representatives on Governing Body should have voting rights
- ☑ JCR representatives should not be excluded from any part of any Governing Body meeting, without extremely good and clearly defined reasons

Debate

1. Jack – should be dropped as JCR president does bring motions, has voting rights Reserved business is discussed with president and can be moved.
2. Chris Davies – only JCR president on governing?
3. Jack - No treasurer also.
4. Gareth Langley– keep this policy so that we don't want reserved business. Wants the motion to be defunct, but shouldn't risk the SCR going back on their word.
5. Alex Franklin – just because something has come about, doesn't mean the policy should be dropped.
6. Mek Mesfin – really important to have voting rights, especially involving JCR
7. Anton - How does the delegate serve? JCR view or personal view?
8. Alex Franklin says that as the only other person with Jack on Governing Body **Donal coughs in annoyance** Jack does a really good job, his and the JCR views are sought and presented.

Move to a Vote

No Opposition to the Policy

POLICY CONTINUED

Socially Responsible Investment

The JCR supports OUSU's Socially Responsible Investment Campaign (SRI). It believes that the college should be open about its investment policy and portfolio. The JCR therefore calls for full transparency, and institutionalisation of rights to transparency in order to ensure accountability in the future.

No Opposition

POLICY CONTINUED

Top-up Fees

The following policy on top-up fees was passed in a referendum on 16th November 2006, at which time the cap on top-up fees was £3000.
This JCR opposes any increase of the current cap on top-up fees.

Debate

1. Gareth Langley - Outdated?
2. Random general discussion about hatred of £9000 fees.
3. Samuel Robberts – Conflating two policies, this policy cannot just be amended to read about a separate issue, especially when we have a Browne Review Policy

Move to a Vote

Nobody in favour of the Policy

POLICY CONTINUED

Motion One - New Heater motion

This JCR Notes:

- The JCR is cold
- There is only one (pretty bad) heater

This JCR Believes:

- Being cold is not fun
- We need more heaters
- Olivia Chinwokwu would like to not be cold anymore

This JCR Resolves:

- To mandate the JCR treasurer and domestic officer to buy 2 new portable heaters for no more than £70.
- **Speak to the College staff first**

Proposed: Olivia Chinwokwu
Seconded: Mike Hardy

Short Factual Questions

Chris Davies – Two heaters?
Zack Hall – I'm not that cold

Mike Hardy – defer to your elders

Mek Mesfin – is £70 enough money?

Olivia – yes

Alex – no problem with spending money to keep us warm

Kezia – Doesn't it seem silly to buy cheap ones?

Alex – they get knocked around

Imogen – Does Sam Cunningham need to know?

Jack – Not if we ensure they must be fireproof

Debate

1. Zack – no point in buying more

Amendment – add 'speak to college staff first' as a second resolve.

Proposed Alex Franklin; **Seconded** Gareth Langley

Accepted as friendly

2. Anton Loning – Two? Really?
3. Mike Hardy – defer to your elders. You don't understand man. You can't heat the whole room without fire, so we have to create pockets of heat.
4. Donal – It is next term which is colder. If there are broken heaters, take them to maintenance. Also, there is a really good heater in Morelli room. We could steal that?

Move to Vote

Overwhelming support for the Motion

MOTION PASSES

Motion Two

This JCR Notes:

- That retrospective payments (i.e. re-embursing someone for something they have already bought) has been a bone of contention for the past couple of years
- That the people who re-wrote the constitution intended on adding a clause discouraging it but forgot...
- That the 6th week meeting is reviewing the policy document

This JCR Believes:

- That retrospective payments should be discouraged

- That saying so in a policy document gives the committee/treasurer a degree of discretion and is not an outright ban
- Adding a clause discouraging retrospective payments to the constitution has little to no effect since it would not be an outright ban. The same effect can be gained by adding to the policy document and only requires one motion to be passed

This JCR Resolves:

- To add the following to the policy document:
The JCR ~~is opposed to~~ discourages retrospective payments which do not come from a pre-approved budget (i.e. reimbursing a member for items they have already bought) and discourages members from bringing such motions. If such an occasion arises that requires such a motion, the member in question should consult the JCR Treasurer before bringing the motion forward.

Proposed: Gareth Langley
 Seconded: Sophie Cass

Short Factual Questions

None

Debate

1. Mek – why does it need to go into the policy document?
2. Jan Willem Scholten – what’s so bad about retrospective motions?
3. Millie Ismail – Pontifex
4. Donal – main reason we have this problem is because James went around buying shit, and then asked for money knowing he could defraud us nonetheless. The main reason is defunct now he has left
5. Jack – interrupts to explain about James’ means of creating budgets and spending money without scrutiny
6. Donal – whenever we did come up with this idea before, we realised a cap would be a good idea. Blow the cap its fine.
7. Jack – interrupts to say that would be in line with other JCRs
8. Donal –£50 or £100 limit seems sensible. Beyond an outright ban, condemnation is silly.
9. **Amendment** – do not come from a pre-approved budget.
Proposed Alex Franklin; **Seconded** Kezia Lock
Accepted as Friendly
10. Alex Franklin– like policy document idea, but shouldn’t be worded strongly. Ugly pressure about the thing being brought to a meeting. Policy document requires less of a limit.
11. Donal – Notes that Lundy got lambasted and sympathy is offered for that
12. **Amendment** – Change wording to ‘The JCR discourages’
Proposed – Alex Franklin, **Seconded** Zack Hall

Accepted as friendly

13. Kezia – if in policy document, committee can discuss it before hand. And make the issue less contentious in the meeting.
14. Mek – why take it to committee? Is this toothless? Must remember the JCR can say no! Forgetting democratic nature of this body. The idea that retrospective payments should be outright negative is wrong
15. Donal – people think things are bought and then need to refunded. Question of scale? Then forgets another point.
16. Kezia – toothless? External pressure does exist to pass retrospective motions as they get contentious. Become personal battles. It is horrible to say no when it's an attack on an individual – wiggle room good idea.
17. Sophie – discourage retrospective motions so that JCR can decide. Two weeks of waiting is not too long
18. Donal – remembers his point. If we think about the last time there was unpleasantness, it was over nothing. Does putting it in cause more anger in the long run?

Gareth Langley - Point of Order

Is there a price limit in constitution already over which a motion must be brought?

Samuel Robberts - No

Move to a vote – overwhelming

Proposition speech – Gareth Langley – why do we need it? Finance abused, is an issue, if its serious should consult committee. Just writes what we believe. Toothless so we have wiggle room.

Opposition speech – Mek Mesfin – toothless is toothless. If someone buys something, there is an imminent demand – the fact it is retrospective becomes focus of the debate. We should discuss the merits of the purchase, not the time of purchase. Not a good resolution.

VOTE

For – 15

Against - 11

Abstentions - 3

MOTION PASSES

Any Other Business

Donal O'hara talks about the ball: drum roll of expectation but no announcement of theme. Friday nights launch night! Governing body was terrible, but became better. Everything going really well. Everybody buy tickets.

Mek Mesfin – will there be a magaluf, shagaluf section in the ball?

Tickets - £60 - Cheapest in oxford

JW – Dress Code? Black tie

Imogen - will it be on mayday? No

Jack plugs 8th week meeting with a promise of a Panto, Mulled wine, santa etc. Jack will be saying his FINAL goodbye

.
College president will be coming for lunch in the JCR soon, but no date is specified.

Jack gets engaged but falls over, cuts finger, hurts mille, forgets to ask the question, uses wrong finger and generally fails at all attempts, but he does get engaged to Millie Ismail.

Meeting closes - 21.01