**Agenda for JCR Meeting, 7.30 p.m., 26th January 2014**

**Chair: Erika Pheby**

**Secretary: Harry Begg**

**Returning Officer: Olivia Thompson**

All Committee Officers Present

The President circulates the plans of the JCR Office and the Library extension.

News from OUSU is circulated.

Anthony Collins, in lieu of the Poet Laureate, reads a poem.

**Ratifications from Previous Meetings (Constitutional)**

**1. No Money = No Tea**

**This JCR notes:**

1) That currently the Constitution is not clear about the rules regarding the JCR Levy and membership, stating that the Levy is both compulsory for members and that people can opt-out.

2) That the JCR Levy is essential for the finances of the JCR

**This JCR believes:**

1) In clarity.

2) That those who opt-out of paying the JCR Levy should not continue to enjoy the benefits this money provides.

**This JCR resolves:**

1) To edit Article 3, Paragraph 6 of the JCR Constitution such that it reads: “All JCR Members shall automatically pay the JCR Levy but they will have the option to opt-out by contacting the JCR Treasurer. Any JCR Member who opts out of the JCR Levy shall not be able to attend JCR Teas, vote on monetary motions at JCR meetings, stand for JCR positions, any dinners that are subsidised by the JCR and events subsidised by the Entz Budget. Upon informing the JCR Treasurer of their decision to opt-out, people will be sent an email by the JCR Treasurer informing them of which rights they have foregone, and subsequent reminder emails may be sent out at the Treasurer’s discretion, but the Treasurer will at no point publicly address the issue. The JCR Treasurer is obliged to keep the list of those who have opted out confidential from all other members of the JCR apart from other members of the executive and the Returning Officer.”

2) To edit Article 8, Paragraph 11 of the JCR Constitution such that it reads: "There shall be an automatic levy on all JCR members. Members may opt-out of this levy subject to the conditions laid out under Article 3."

Proposed: Hannah Murphy

Seconded: Hattie Langley

Short Factual Questions

None

Debate

None

No opposition, motion passes.

**Motions as submitted**

**2. Life After Corpus Hand Book**

This JCR Notes:

Life After Corpus hand book is finished.

This JCR Believes:

We should thank those that contributed by sending them a copy.

Postage is expensive.

This JCR Resolves:

To reimburse the cost of the postage, which should be no more than £15 (some people live abroad which will cost a bit more).

Proposed: Grace Holland

Seconded: Emily Miller

Short Factual Questions

None

Debate

Emily: Please can we amend this to £25? We didn’t realise the cost for international destinations.

Grace: Accepted as friendly.

No opposition, motion passes.

**4. Audio Equipment (reimbursement)**

**This JCR Notes:**

- Prior to the Christmas bop we needed an amplifier unit and associated cables to drive some speakers.

- The Entz budget was spread thin so Barney (in his benevolence) purchased the equipment himself for use during the bop.

- The ongoing loan of equipment will cease when Barney graduates(or fails to graduate) in two years.

**This JCR Believes:**

- That the JCR should not be dependent Barney's own sound equipment.

- That Barney should be reimbursed for the cost of the amplifier and cables (£153.97) hence transferring ownership to the JCR

- That barney must be some kind of super cool guy for making sure bops have loud music.

**This JCR Resolves:**

- To reimburse Barney for the cost of the amplifier and cables (£153.97)

Proposed: Thomas Heaps

Seconded: Cameron McGarry

Short Factual Questions:

Steph: We should add something to say that this is retrospective?

Tom: We are just making a deal to buy the cables off him that we have been using. Amend to “Purchase Barney’s cables provided receipts are received”.

Debate:

Ian: He needs the receipts.

Toby A: Why do we need a receipt? I can tell you it costs this much.

Hannah: This agenda becomes the receipt.

Ian: Fine – but receipts if possible from Barney.

No opposition, motion passes.

**5. Motions of Particular Note**

**This JCR notes:**

That sometimes, motions may be proposed which are strongly supported by a group of people but are not necessarily supported by the majority of JCR members.

That in these cases, the JCR members supporting the motion are more likely to show up than other JCR members, who are more indifferent.

That in these cases, members of the JCR Executive may feel the need to make the JCR extra aware of the motion to make sure that the composition of the JCR Meeting reflects the will of the JCR as a whole.

That the group that proposed the motion may feel offended if members of the JCR Executive send out an email about their motion, but not about others.

**This JCR believes:**

That members of the JCR Executive should not have to make the potentially controversial decision of whether or not to make the JCR aware of such motions.

That a group proposing a motion will not be offended if the making aware of the motion to the JCR is standard procedure.

That it would be fair to have an objective standard for when to send an email to JCR about controversial motions.

**This JCR resolves:**

To insert into the Standing Orders of the Vice-President as Duty 12. : "to send emails to the JCR informing it of: 1. Any proposed monetary motion other than the Treasurer's Budget that calls for the spending of more than £350 in one term. 2. Any proposed Motion of No Confidence. 3. Any proposed motion to abolish a JCR committee position or a committee of the JCR."

Proposed: Tobias Wijvekate

Seconded: Saul Cooper

Short Factual Questions

Josh Bell: What is standard procedure for an emergency motion?

Chair: There isn’t one.

Tom: If it only gets the required number of signatures 30 seconds before how would it change anything?

Toby: The VP would have to send an e-mail. That is the inherent problem with emergency motions.

Emily: Does this apply to motions in the standard agenda?

Toby Abbott: In the e-mail it should state the agenda in basic form as well as in the attachment.

Alex Rankine: What is the reasoning behind £350?

Toby: £350 and under can be uncontroversial. £400 is a large sum and there should be some review.

Sandy: Is there any change to the procedure involving emergency motions?

Toby: It’s any proposed motion involving money. Doesn’t matter whether it’s an emergency motion.

Debate

Tom: The point of this is tackling controversy. It doesn’t matter if it’s £350 or £50; it can be controversial in either case. This motion should cover all emergency up until the beginning of the committee meeting – that it a reasonable cut off. Amendment to have a standardised procedure: any emergency motion received immediately preceding the start of the committee meeting, i.e. 7 p.m.

Amendment accepted as friendly

Chris: People should open the agenda and not rely on emails.

Toby: It’s not about making sure we don’t pass controversial motions; it’s more specifically about avoiding scenarios in which this can happen. It’s making sure people don’t get offended with an email.

Josh: Someone will just ask for £349 in the motion’s current state.

Amy: £350 is arbitrary. Why £350? Why not £200?

Tom: If there is anything particularly controversial people find out about it through word of mouth. We don’t need the extra emails except in the case of emergency motions. Amendment to take out clauses 1-3 of ‘JCR Resolves’ and just include emergency motions.

Toby: Amendment taken as hostile.

Debate on amendment:

Nikil Venkatesh: I don’t agree with that amendment. Most of us IN THIS ROOM would have been talking about this but this isn’t the case with a lot of people in the wider JCR community. We should make sure everyone is aware of ‘controversial’ motions.

Ian Headley: £350 is quite unusual. Important to highlight controversial motions. The VP should not feel like it is a personal issue.

Jamie: What is the harm of putting this in an email?

Steph: Could we not just do a summary of all the motions in the VP’s email?

Tom: Previous VPs have summarised the agenda in the email. What you’re saying here is that the agenda should be in an email which isn’t the point. If they care at all they will read the attachment. I object to Nikil’s point that people don’t talk about the JCR – people just choose not to come to the meetings.

Toby: Controversial motions in the body of the email is the best compromise here.

Josh: If you can’t save 5 minutes to read through a Word document then you’re not interested enough; but a summary could be helpful.

Sandy: The most controversial motion in this meeting so far has been this one, and it wouldn’t fall under these categories.

Ian: These are healthy parameters. This isn’t trying to define everything that’s controversial but this gives some framework for the VP to work with.

Tom: The only time when this would have helped is the emergency motion last term about football. An informal agreement where the VP summarises the agenda in the meeting would be fine.

Toby: We can make it an informal decision for the VP to highlight the specific details but this could lead to controversy. It could create problems for the group that feels marginalized.

Vote in favour of amendment: 12

Votes against: More than 12.

Amendment fails.

Steph: We should mandate the VP to make a short summary of two sentences to highlight what each motion says. Amendment to change Duty 12 to read “summarise the motions to the JCR mail list informing them of the substantial material of each and every motion in no more than two sentences”.

Toby: Amendment taken as friendly.

Alex R: This is a minor safeguard. The strongest safeguard is a 2/3 majority on financial motions which was often missed last year.

Tom: 2/3 majority was in place – that’s not true.

Move to vote

Overwhelming majority, motion passes.

**6. Scholars’ Gowns for Scholars and Exhibitioners**

**This JCR notes:**

That the issues raised regarding scholars and exhibitioners requiring cheques have been resolved by Neil McLynn.

**This JCR believes:**

That this change is a good thing.

**This JCR resolves:**

To support the change to a system whereby money is issued via cheques rather than deductions from battels.

Proposed: Amy Jones

Seconded: Hattie Langley

Short Factual Questions

Anthony: Why is it considered that cheques are easier?

Amy: Peoples’ battels were paid by parents and people couldn’t afford the gowns because they didn’t see the money. Battels are at different time of year.

Cameron: How is the JCR going to do this?

Amy: It’s just showing support.

Move to vote.

No opposition, motion passes.

**7. Trans\* Policy**

**This JCR notes**

1. The University's Equality Policy is designed to provide an inclusive environment, which 'promotes equality, values diversity and maintains a working, learning and social environment in which the rights and dignity of all its staff and students are respected.'

2. That gender reassignment is one of the protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty 2011.

3. That recently this has been supplemented with a new policy regarding trans\* people at the university, along with a set of clear guidelines on its implementation.

4. That this policy has been a year in the making, and offers a comprehensive checklist on how colleges can help trans\* individuals, in particular in relation to supporting them if they are in the process of transitioning.

5. That, as per the guidelines, a person acts as a named point of contact for those who wish to notify college of their wish to transition.

**This JCR believes**

1. That the practicalities of implementing the policy are not significant, most of the bathroom facilities across our sites are not gender exclusive for example.

3. That in implementing this policy Corpus demonstrates a solid commitment to equality and the dignity of its members.

**This JCR Resolves**

1. That the JCR’s equal opportunities committee and welfare committee should work with college to implement this policy.

2. That they should report back to the JCR on their progress at the beginning of Trinity.

Proposed: Ian Headley

Seconded: Jamie Wells

Short Factual Questions

Nikil: Would it affect conventions e.g. Male & Female Welfare Officers?

Ian: It’s a form of support – this is a very comprehensive policy. It’s making sure that individuals are protected. It doesn’t raise any questions for the running of the JCR.

Toby A: Is part of the policy to have facilities unisex?

Ian: Gender neutral toilet facilities. Can we have a gender neutral changing room, for example? It’s about opening the discussion with college.

Debate

Tom: Print off an appendix with the policy – mandate the VP to do this in future.

Amendment adopted as friendly.

No opposition, motion passes.

**Emergency Motions**

**Budget**

Short Factual Questions

Jamie: Welfare is £550 peer support £50.

Grace: Is Careers getting a budget?

Ian: Yes, sure.

Tom: Take money from Challenge.

Emily (Careers): £50 would be good.

Ian: Fine.

Ian: £2300 for Challenge remaining.

**No oppostion, motion passes.**