**MINUTES OF AN ORDINARY JCR MEETING**

**Sunday 4th Week MT12**

**Chair:** Kezia Lock (JCR President)

**Secretary:** Peter Fitzsimons

**Returning Officer**: Gareth Langley

**JCR Members present:** 64+

**28th October 2012**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

**Present:**

JCR President- Kezia Lock

JCR Treasurer- Konrad Hepworth

Academic Affairs Officer- Gege Parthasarathy

Access & Admissions Officer- Alice Evans

Accommodation Officer- Sam Robberts

Charities & RAG Officer- Joe McCrudden

Clubs & Societies Officer- Sam Hodgson

Domestic Officer- Patricia Stephenson

Environment and Ethics Officer- Zack Hall

Entz President - Tom Heaps

Equal Ops President- Steph Cherill

OUSU Officer- Nick Dickinson

Returning Officer- Gareth Langley

Welfare Officer (Female) - Jess Lewis

Welfare Officer (Male)- Sam Newhouse

**Apologies:**

Arts Officer- Chris Ewing

International Students’ Officer- Moritz Borrmann

**JCR Committee Meeting:**

* Discussion of Motion 1, and how the motion might work in practice.
* Kezia Lock, JCR President, discusses upcoming meetings, including:   
  - discussion with the college welfare team and other colleges r.e. complaints about Dr Gancz, the college doctor.  
  - meeting with the Bursar about his new proposed college funding system for extra-curricular activities. Currently funding allocated by Junior Deans and Blues. Also to discuss the new system of direct funding of OUSU and the Bursar’s merging of the hardship fund and the emergency fund. Hopes for a new form so there is no stigma attached to applying for funding.
* Kezia Lock also to instruct Gege Parthasarathy on how to run an Academic Feedback Session.
* Also whether Corpus-Univ sports ground should be opened up to local comprehensive schools and discussion of the existing sharing arrangement between the two colleges
* Joe McCrudden asks whether we should have a charity formal this term, because of a number of ‘special’ formals already.
* Gareth Langley talks about the upcoming JCR elections.
* Kezia Lock also explains a call for JCR volunteers at an eco-café which rents land from the college. Also, a representative from Ormond College, Australia, has contacted us asking to meet up and discuss our JCR structure.

**1. Anonymously-submitted motions**

**This JCR Notes:**  
- that proposing some motions can have negative consequences for the proposer  
- that the identity of the proposer or seconder of a motion might affect whether a motion passes or not

**This JCR Believes:**  
- motions should be passed on merit alone.  
- controversial motions should be able to be brought forward and discussed fairly without risk of backlash

**This JCR Resolves:**   
- to allow members of the JCR to propose motions to JCR meetings anonymously  
~~- to amend this motion during the current JCR meeting to detail how this will work in practice~~- to allow JCR members to nominate any other member of the JCR, including themselves, as a proxy for proposing/seconding a motion. The de facto proxy is the JCR President or Vice-President. If submitted, a written argument in favour of the motion will be read out by the JCR President.  
- to ensure that anonymous motions are approved by the President or a list of 35 signatures.  
- to create an anonymous account which JCR members can use to submit anonymous motions.  
- to mandate the President to email out to the JCR any anonymously-submitted motions which have been deemed controversial.  
- to allow JCR members to submit anonymous motions either via email or by putting them in the President’s pidge.

Proposed: Noah Evans-Harding  
Seconded: Peter Fitzsimons

**Short Factual Questions:**

Dom McGovern: Compulsory?

Noah Evans-Harding: Free choice.

Joe McCrudden: Why?

Noah: For reasons described. Not an issue for vast majority of motions, but some cause a lot of trouble.

Joe Mc: Anonymous for both proposer and seconder?

Noah: Yes?

Sam Robberts: How to stop abuse this power with dozens of motions?

Noah: Needs to be discussed. Board for ones shot down by President using controversiality powers, then can be restored with 35 signatures?

**Debate:**

Alex Coupe: How effective? Someone arguing for and against, obvious who proposed because they will speak for.

Joe Mc: Who is going to answer SFQs?

Felix Neate: If you aren’t prepared to argue your case, should the JCR listen?

Felipe Monge Imedio: People aren’t afraid of making suggestions, motion is unnecessary.

Noah: It’s hard to tell whether people are/aren’t afraid of making suggestions.

Sam Newhouse: It’s harmless, they are quite a few people who aren’t comfortable in the JCR, allows them to get their views across without leaving comfort zone.

Andrew Dickinson: Anonymous voting system already exists.

Sam N: Little harm, as long as provision for no misuse.

**Amendment, Gege Parthasarathy:** add to resolves, ‘to allow JCR members to nominate themselves as a proxy.’ Taken as friendly.

**Amendment, Sam Robberts:** add to resolves, ‘to ensure that anonymous motions are approved by the President or a list of 35 signatures.’ Taken as friendly.

**Amendment, Alex Coupe:** add to resolves, ‘the President must email out any anonymously-submitted motions to the JCR,’ ‘to allow JCR members to nominate any member of the JCR as a proxy.’ Taken as friendly.

**Amendment, Sam Newhouse:** add to resolves, ‘to ensure that a written argument in favour of anonymously-submitted motions, if submitted, will be read by the JCR President.’ Taken as friendly.

Felipe: If you aren’t willing to stand by your opinion, don’t expect me to respect it.

Andrew D: Use of a board doesn’t give anonymity?

Rachel Dellar: Like JCR condoms at the moment, anonymously email.

**Amendement, Rachel Dellar:** add to resolves, ‘to create an anonymous email account which JCR members can use to submit anonymous motions.’ Taken as friendly.

Sophie Kelley: If you’re choosing a proxy, need your rules?

Kezia Lock: Peer supporters?

Megan McCullough: Needs peer supporters come to meeting, unfair on them?

Tom Heaps: Trying too hard? Not all motions need 35 signatures, just the controversial ones.

**Amendment, Kezia Lock:** add to resolves, ‘the de facto proxy is Vice-President or JCR President.’ Taken as friendly.

Nick Dickinson: So complex, most people won’t know it exists.

**Move to vote, Joe McCrudden:** seconded by many.

No opposition to move to a vote.

**Speaking in Opposition: Felipe Monge Imedio**: What I just said.

**Speaking in Proposition: Sam Robberts**: Do it.

**Vote**

Overwhelmingly in favour, **motion passes**

**2. Conservative Equal Ops representation**

**This JCR Notes:**  
- that we have an equal opportunities committee with individuals on it to represent minorities in this JCR who are often perceived as being subject to prejudice from society  
- this JCR delights in claiming to be a welcoming place - a small and friendly college  
- that within this JCR people who are politically to the right are often actively isolated, personally attacked, and made to feel unwelcome  
- conservative views and opinions are not currently free to be aired

**This JCR Believes:**  
-  that the JCR should be a welcoming place for all people  
-  that it is not okay to accuse someone of ‘hating the gays’, ‘being a rape apologist’, accusing them of being ignorant, saying that their views are insulting or misguided and dismissing their views and beliefs out of hand because they happen to be different to the majority.  
- it is exactly because of these sorts of attacks that the Equal Ops Committee positions exist.  
- in being consistent in our policy to all groups of people

**This JCR Resolves:**  
~~- to represent the conservative minority in this JCR on the Equal Ops Committee and to charge this committee member with ensuring that conservative views and opinions are free to be aired in the JCR  
- to amend the Constitution and Standing Orders appropriately~~  
- to mandate the Equal Opportunities President to ensure that JCR members do not discriminate or name-call in the JCR on the basis of political views.

Proposed: Samuel Robberts  
Seconded: ~~Emily Boocock~~ Felipe Monge Imedio

**Short Factual Questions:**

Andrew Dickinson: Any political reps on the Committee at the moment?

Kezia Lock: No.

Jess Lewis: How would they ensure that such opinions are free to air?

Sam Robberts: By raising these points at Equal Ops Committee, complaining and making noise if things aren’t going well in this respect.

**Debate:**

Rachel Dellar: 1) Is the right-wing a minority? As a percentage of the JCR-active people not so small. Might not always be minority. 2) Equal Ops are all for things that you have no choice in, whereas political views you choose.

Felix Neate: Why not represent everyone? JCR changes, one side of the political spectrum not always in minority/majority.

**Amendment, Felix Neate:** edit resolves 1, ‘to create a political equality rep on the Equal Ops Committee and to charge this committee member with ensuring that all political views and opinions are free to be aired in the JCR.’ Taken as friendly.

Rachel D: That job is President’s job.

Sam R: I’m not free to air my political views, people aren’t willing to engage in debate with me. Problems with being Romney supporter on US election night. People not quite so outgoing see JCR as hostile.

**Amendment, Chris Davies:** strike all resolves and replace with ‘To mandate the Equal Ops President: to ensure that JCR members do not discriminate or name-call in the JCR on the basis of political views.’ Taken as friendly.

Move to vote, no opposition

Felipe Monge Imedio: This is a very important motion, about accusing, attacking. I’m not free to air my more radical opinions. Think carefully.

Abigail Burman: The positions exist to rectify systemic discrimination, not personal disagreements. Political disagreements work both ways. Welfare reps could look into this. Not the Equal Ops Presidents’ role.

Rachel D: There is freedom of speech but people don’t have to listen to beliefs they find offensive.

Joe Minton-Branfoot: Name calling so broad, what does it mean?

**Speech in proposition, Nick Dickinson**: Political views are really important, very systemic discrimination, debate doesn’t affect views as much as you think.

**Speech in opposition, Abigail Burman:** You can’t mandate people to be nice to each other.

**Vote**

30 in favour

24 in opposition

**Motion passes**

**3. Funding for Cuntry Living magazine**

**This JCR Notes:**  
- the feminist ‘zine Cuntry Living has provided an important outlet for feminist thought in the university while also having some kick ass illustrations  
- while in the past the ‘zine has been fully funded by the Exeter JCR, changes to funding protocols mean that the ‘zine needs to seek funding from other JCRs

**This JCR Believes:**  
- feminism is great  
- magazine collages and feminist writing are a really great combination.

**This JCR Resolves:**  
to allocate £50 to Cuntry Living for the purpose of printing this year’s issue.

Proposed: Abigail Burman  
Seconded: Cora Salkovskis

**Short Factual Questions:**

Blessing Ingyang: Do we get JCR copies?

Abigail Burman: Yes.

Nick Dickinson: Do they sell it?

Abigail B: No, just publish.

Felix Neate: How many do we get?

Abigail B: Don’t know, at least three.

Millie Ismail: How long term commitment?

Kezia Lock: Just this year.

**Debate:**

Felipe M: If feminism is about equality, why isn’t it called equalism?

**Move to vote**: no opposition

**Speaking in Opposition, Felipe Monge Imedio:** I am interested in magazines and have lots of different interests, but do not get JCR funding for this.

**Proposition, Abigail Burman:** It’s a gesture of support, not a way of buying magazines.

**Vote**

22 in favour

22 in opposition

**Motion falls**

**4. David Guetta really does just want to make you sweat**

**This JCR Notes:**winter is a cold time

**This JCR Believes:**the JCR never seems to have enough heaters

**This JCR Resolves:**to mandate the JCR Treasurer to purchase electric heaters for up to £93.27

Proposed: Chris Davies  
Seconded: Lara Conway-Yeats

**Short Factual Questions:**

Chris Davies: This buys 2 or 3 heaters.

Felix Neate: Isn’t it cheaper to ask college to fix broken heaters?

Chris D: That’s been tried before, unsuccesfully.

**Debate:**

**Amendment, Sam Robberts:** mandate Konrad Hepworth, JCR Treasurer to do it. Taken as friendly.

Arthur Graham-Dixon: It’s not that cold, this is pointless spending.

Millie Ismail: It gets colder next term.

**Speaking in Opposition, Arthur Graham-Dixon:** What I just said.

**Speaking in Proposition, Sam Hodgson:** Being warm is nice.

**Vote**

Overwhelmingly in favour, **motion passes**

**5. Still Banging**

**This JCR Notes:**- people sometimes vom in the JCR  
- Ahmed’s, although it may be nutritional, it doesn’t always leave a pleasant smell in the morning

**This JCR Believes:**having a clean and fresh JCR is better

**This JCR Resolves:**to purchase plug-in air fresheners for the JCR (up to £27)

Proposed: Chris Davies  
Seconded: Peter Fitzsimons

**Short Factual Questions:**

Tom Heaps: Need refilling, who will do it?

Chris Davies: Only used for emergencies.

Millie Ismail and Zack Hall move to vote.

Konrad Hepworth: Could use spray freshener instead, it’s cheaper. Spending from domestic budget, instead of motion.

Motion withdrawn.

**6. The Great Brunch Reform Act (2012)**

**This JCR Notes:**- 1st Hall on a Friday possibly has only occurred once in the last 3 years  
- that the current pricing system for brunch is as follows:

£X (~£1.50??) – Base Price for – Toast, Tea/Coffee, 1 Juice and 1 Cereal  
£0.47 – For each item purchased

**This JCR Believes:**- that it’s time for change  
- in the existence of first Hall on a Friday  
- that brunch is ridiculously expensive  
- that the disparity in pricing between brunch and breakfast is insane since the only extra thing we get is 1 small box of cereal

**This JCR Resolves:**- for the Domestic Officer to enquire about the existence of first hall  
- for the Domestic Officer to negotiate the following:

To remove cereal from the price of brunch  
To price brunch the same way as breakfast

OR

To set the Base Price as £1.00 (Cereal costs £0.50 extra)  
For each additional item to cost £0.40 (except pastries to stay at current price)  
(e.g. 5 items, would be ~ £2.80, currently ~ £4 )

Proposed: Chris Davies  
Seconded: Felipe Monge

Patricia Stephenson, Domestic Officer, has already contacted college authorities in order to enact the suggested changes.

Motion withdrawn.

**7. More rigorous email vetting**

This JCR Notes:  
- that each nexus email is sent to 280 individuals  
- that emails are being sent out on the nexus meant for as few as 6 people

This JCR Believes:  
- that overusing the nexus can be variously annoying/boring/make people apathetic to the JCR  
- that only issues that are relevant to a large number of JCR members and cannot be spread by other means should be sent over the JCR maillist

This JCR Resolves:  
- to mandate the President and the Vice-President to be much more rigorous in rejecting emails which are not useful to a large number of people and could not be communicated by alternative methods.  
- to urge the JCR to show restraint in sending out needless emails  
- to encourage advertisement of mailist creation  
- to create year-specific mailing lists

Proposed:- Samuel Robberts  
Seconded: Nick Dickinson

**Short Factual Questions:**

Sam Hodgson: a way for mailist for 1st years, second years etc.

Kezia Lock: Yes

Sophie Kelley: Current rules for vetting?

Kezia: Discretionary.

**Debate:**

Felipe: Not interested in the emails. However, can’t be certain which people would be interested.

Sam Robberts: Qualification, number of emails received is increasing. People complaining about lost whisky, people stealing staircase 8 food. Mailist not for lost things, or group of 6 or 7 people. Emails go out to 280 people.

Kezia: Reason for staircase 8 email is that staircase 8 is just above the JCR and therefore many people have access.

Tom Heaps: Football team sent to people who have expressed an interest. Werewolf does not have the same rule. Things which are established should have their own mailing list and become a club.

Dom McGovern: Small enough JCR. I like the quirky ones. Nice to know different people. Keep as is.

Alex Mason: Create 1st, 2nd 3rd year mailing list.

Kezia: Can V-P and President judge what’s important to different years correctly?

Alex M: President of society moderates mailing list.

**Amendment, Sam Robberts:** Create year specific mailing list.

Felipe Monge Imedio: horrible idea. Don’t separate years. Dom’s point important.

Megan McCullough: what would happen if you lose something? That’s a reason for using the list. Only use if you don’t know who to contact.

Zack Hall: Pointless JCR motion. Make an amendment for the JCR to shoot down pointless motions.

Dom McGovern and Sam Hodgson move to vote.

Rachel Dellar: who vets separate year group emails?

Kezia: President and Vice-President.

**Amendment, Tom Heaps:** add to resolves, ‘to encourage advertisement of mailist creation.’ Taken as friendly.

Livvy Elder: Could we join 3rd and 4th year mailists?

**Vote**

28 in favour

4 against

**Motion passes**

Charity Husts then are run by Joe McCrudden