

CORPUS JCR



MEETING AGENDA

Second Week, Michaelmas Term 2024

Sunday Twentieth October, 7:30 PM

President & Chair: Elias Laurent

Vice-President & Secretary: Angelina Hong

Returning Officer & Constitutional Oracle: Jacob Harvey

Oskari proposes a Procedural Motion to make the JCR president cede the Chair for the rest of the meeting.

Elias: For clarification, I will not be chairing the no-con section of the meeting anyways but Oskari's motion will remove me from chairing the rest of the meeting as well.

Jacob: We have a procedural motion to remove JCR president, Elias, from chairing the rest of the meeting and the chair will go to Angelina, the Vice President. The chair is in charge of coordinating and managing the flow of debate. The vote is conducted by a show of hands. Prior to the vote, if anyone is willing to do so, there is allowed up to one speech for the motion and one speech against. Is there anyone in favour? Yes, Oskari has the floor.

Speech in favour (Oskari):

The no-confidence motion is controversial, I feel like to give a fair chance to the motion, even if it is very controversial, we should remove Elias as chair. And this is because, for example, if I am noconned, I am only allowed to speak in favour of myself only during that motion., but Elias, as chair, has the whole time up until that motion to speak in his favour. In the name of equality of all the officers in how they are treated, it is beneficial to remove Elias as chair for the whole meeting, even though we are doing the no-confidence motion first. Moreover, I think this gives the no-confidence motion the fairest chance to succeed even though it is highly controversial. Because of the anonymity of the motion, the proposer cannot defend it. I feel like it is fairest to the motion that Elias is only allowed to defend himself during that motion, and let his answers absolve himself during that time.

Elias: Can I now respond?

Jacob: Yes.

Speech against (Elias):

My response is pretty simple, this motion comes first and that is, of course, unless someone makes a procedural motion to move it to later. After that, my main point in staying as chair is because there is one motion further down the line which comes from a result of a long conversation from me with college. And therefore, if I am still president after the no confidence motion, then I think it will be quite useful for me to present this motion from the position of the chair. I also don't see the need to extend it, given that the no confidence motion comes first. I understand what Oskari is saying about the fairness, I don't see how my being chair for the rest of the meeting gives me any advantage, or give me any more opportunities.

Arian requests a secret ballot.

Jacob: Okay: secret ballot.

Arian rescinds the request for secret ballot.

Jacob: Vote in favour, to remove Elias from the chair. Vote against, to keep Elias in the Chair.

Vote:

In favour: 18
Against: 21
Abstain: 19

Jacob: The Procedural Motions now fails, and so Elias remains as chair.

The Procedural Motion does not pass and Elias remains as chair.

1. Report from the President

Elias: Firstly, welcome back everyone and welcome to a lot of you for the first time to the JCR. Last time I gave a report, rent negotiations hadn't been properly finalised yet, so first we will talk about rent negotiations then Freshers' Week. Rent negotiations were conducted by me and Treya and we were very happy with the outcome. We had a 2.1% rise in rent which is below the increase in student loan and maintenance loan and CPI. Also, a lot of changes agreed: BC now will have student bartenders on the weekends which is a new thing for the first time. The BC is now also open during the day as a café during the week – people should check it out. If you like it please go there as this is a trial period right now and they have a good selection of food. There was also an email sent out at the end of last term but for the Freshers, you are more than welcome to ask for this email to be forwarded to you.

Second thing is Freshers' Week. My impression and the consensus of the Committee from the Committee Meeting that we just had was that Freshers' was a massive success. We want to thank the Freshers for coming and making all the massive turnout for events. Some of the highest attendance that we have ever seen for some events. We even had Lance comment on the C-bop as one of the best he's ever seen, which we love to see. Thank you mainly to all the Officers who took part in Freshers' Week: a lot to coordinate and work on over the summer and very, very grateful to all the Officers.

2. Questions to Officers

Elias: Now, we have questions to Officers. Anyone is allowed to ask me or any other Officer about the work that we are doing.

Arian: I had a question about last year. Because you had rent negotiations, you said that you weren't going to talk to college yet about the motion put in about supporting Oxford Action for Palestine. What is the progress on that?

Elias: We have actually had a lot of progress about that, actually with divestment with Nick, the bursar. We had this over the summer over Zoom with me and one member of the MCR. That went very well, we had Nick ask us to send him the list of companies that we thought was necessary to divest from. That was sent by the MCR which I have overseen and approved of. That is now sent to Nick who is going through that list and checking where we might be liable. Nick thinks that it is unlikely that we have any investments with them but I will keep checking up on that throughout the term.

3. Reading from the Poet Laureate

Cathy: May I read two poems?

Elias: Of course.

Poem 1

The Suffragette's Song

It was the 121st anniversary (on October 10th) of the formation of the 'Women's Social and Political Union' (WSPU), which marked the official beginning of the 'Suffragette Movement'. In lieu of that, here is a poem to commemorate it:

_... .. _...

Night by night, I sit up by
The candlelight and write
As my husband snores
Cor! He's such a bore-
Why can't we ladies have the vote?

In the morning, up betimes
I brew his daily coffee
As my husband sits
Cor! He's such a twit-
Why can't we ladies have the vote?

In the noon, no time to swoon
I labour cooking lunch
As my husband chomps
Cor! He's such a pomp-
Why can't we ladies have the vote?

In the evening, I light the hearth
And strip down to my petticoats
As my husband waits
Like an illiterate
Why can't we ladies have the vote?

I long for the day
When *we* // have the say
Our womenfolk and girls,
When we won't have to be
At the beck and the call
And behest of idle Earls!

Poem 2

The Stirring

I believe this is the only JCR meeting before Halloween, so here's a Halloweeny poem in advance.

The gong inside the church's spindly tower
Tolled the misty, midnight hour
The cell was damp and drab and dewy
The shine of the grey moon smirked within
Like some changeling's impish simper, in a looking-glass.

Russell Witherfort
Convicted and condemned of all charges
Left alone in the cell in daylight to bake,
Like a rueful loaf of rye
And by starlight—to rot,
Like a pale, insipid eye,

Was up betimes; his grimy hands, he pressed to the bars
In the corner near his cot.

There was a shuffling within the walls that had woken him
A kind of sinister stirring
Insidiae incarnate (In-si-dee-ah)
His eyes strained to sense what they could not see,
'O, protege me, munitio meus', (O, prota-shjey may, mu-neeto may-us)
His addled brain traced the words
His breath smoked again in the moonbeam
Like the smoke of a dreary dragon

And suddenly those eyes of his saw it-
The revelation
Of The Stirring.

II.

It had been centuries since old Russell had swung.
My father bought the place in the 80's,
It had been a cold war bunker throughout the 70's
Tins of tomato soup still lined the walls
Rank and ornamental, like grim soldiers
My mother didn't like to go down there
Alone
Or for long,
Because anytime that she did
She swore that she heard...
A shuffling from behind the tins on the wall,
And from the corner of her eye, she glimpsed
The revelation
Of The Stirring.

4. Ratifications from Previous Meetings

5. Constitutional Amendments

6. Motions of No Confidence

Elias: I will now cede the chair to Angelina. I think that it is also important for everyone to know that Marion, the Dean, is here on Zoom. That is because I have, as a result from this motion, filed a formal bullying and harassment complaint. I will explain a bit more on that later.

Angelina now takes the place of chair.

Jacob: Angelina is now Chair. She is now in charge of running the debate. I emphasise, as RO, the importance of maintaining in the JCR a civil atmosphere and focusing the discussion on solely factual matters, rather than making an attack. Angelina, go ahead.

Angelina: There has been a request by members of the JCR committee that Exec explain the procedure and events surrounding the recent No-Con motion. This is a constitutional right according to Section 23 – Clause IV. As such, the following is what discussed after the No-Con was submitted to the RO.

- We had an Exec Committee meeting with all 4 members of exec, where Elias told Executive Committee to dismiss the motion.
- Executive committee – as in the three of us – then independently decided there were sufficient grounds to bring the No Con. After we decided there was grounds, Elias repeatedly asked Jacob privately to not bring it, without providing constitutional reason.
- He then went to college, citing welfare concerns about the motion.
- Exec was concerned about these welfare issues, and hence decided that it would be appropriate to request the proposer to edit the motion to bring it in line with the welfare concerns and exclude any potentially harmful phrasing or statements.
- Proposers always have a right to edit motions after they submit them, as has been done repeatedly in the past.
- The proposer was very apologetic about the tone and had independently asked to amend the motion to make it more welfare friendly.
- Elias submitted an official welfare complaint, and explicitly asked Jacob to convey to the proposer that he would not withdraw it unless the proposer withdrew their motion and apologised in person. We have proof of this if necessary.
- He then asked the Executive Committee to let him pick which version of the motion to admit and suggested that the more aggressive one should go to meeting, because it would be more pragmatic for him.
- Additionally, he was very angry at Exec for approving the email that sent the motion to the JCR.

Jacob: Also, there is a statement from Beth, who was not able to attend today, to be read out by Angelina:

Statement from Beth:

I cannot speak on behalf of the other officers who resigned, but my resignation was not a reflection of the president's ability to support me in my role. I was originally going to resign last term because I didn't feel I had enough time to dedicate to the JCR, but I did speak to the president and he helped me put measures in place to step back as I needed to. I did feel supported by the president when I raised my concerns to him, and my resignation this term was not a reflection of the state of the JCR nor a lack of support. I was not approached prior to this motion's submission to confirm my reasoning for resigning and so I felt it important that it not be misconstrued.

Jacob: Now, you read the motion.

Angelina reads the motion.

A MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE JCR PRESIDENT OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE MT23 - MT24

“This JCR notes that...”

- The JCR President, while having approached the job in good faith and with good intentions, is clearly **overwhelmed with the responsibilities** that it entails. This has been routinely acknowledged in the JCR by the President.
- There has been a **consistent lack of organisation, communication, team management, enthusiasm and efficiency in the JCR Committee** this year. A variety of **JCR officers have resigned** their roles in recent time, demonstrating the **lack of help given by the President** in alleviating stresses and hearing concerns from officers before it reaches that stage.

- The role of President is a role that deserves **full commitment and efficient management of a team** and the responsibilities expected, rather than **crisis management**.
- The issues in this No-Con concern the fact that **this President's work is disorganised, that he is unable to do the required work on time, that his work is not planned in advance, and that he is unprofessional with his team, re: the JCR.**
 - Given that all of these **concerns** about his organisation and management skills were **raised in the MT23 presidential election**, these are clearly **long-standing concerns** that the JCR has had about this President.
- The motion is of a sensitive and anonymous nature, because it includes a member of the Executive Committee. This makes the matter complicated because of the facilities available in Section 16, Clause V of the constitution for the Executive Committee to **decide independently to dismiss a no-confidence motion** based on 'sufficient evidence' – i.e. fulfilment of standing orders and mandates – and Section 5, Clause III which gives **primacy to the President in interpreting mandates and standing orders.**
 - Therefore, it is requested that **all communication between the Executive Committee about the motion should be released publicly to the JCR** (since the submitter of the motion wishes to remain anonymous), in accordance with Section 23, Clause IV. This should be done at the **start of the Week 2 meeting** with the onus for this being on all members of the Executive Committee.

A Summary:

1. The President spent 185 pounds on the JCR Card irresponsibly and unconstitutionally.
2. The President organised Freshcom and Fresher's week badly.
3. JCR Committee is run poorly and unprofessionally and at times includes verbal aggression.
4. The President fails to make it to required committees.
5. The President continuously does last minute work, affecting JCR outcomes.

"This JCR believes that..."

The following constitute reasons for a no-confidence motion, as cited in Section 14 Clause 1: "consistent breaches of Standing Orders" and "evidence of serious misbehaviour".

1. The unconstitutional **spending of £185 on drinks at the Trinity Varsity Bop without JCR approval of a monetary motion.** (Section 41, Clause III & IV)
2. A **failure to coordinate Freshcom** causing disorganisation, a lack of clarity for officers who served on Freshcom and a reduced quality of experience for Freshers and returning students. This stands in violation of Standing Order 12. The consequences include but are not limited to:
 - **Failure to organise any Freshcom meeting in advance** leading to confusion for officers; all meetings except one were held in September. This is in contrast to previous years, where meetings were held regularly from Trinity onwards. The led to the following:
 - **Extremely delayed start of sales of Freshers' club tickets - on the Sunday of 0th week** due to lack of following up by the President of officers he is responsible for.
 - Last minute creation of the Freshers Guide, and event planning placed stress on Officers as they returned for collections. This is part of a pattern of work being assigned last minute by the President and therefore being rushed.
 - **No communication** in advance of Fresher Week events **to the JCR** causing **poor attendance of events** like Subject Drinks; this, and other plans were left to the Entz Instagram account on the day of the event. The President once again failed to show initiative with an event he is ultimately responsible for.
 - **Last minute organisation** of communicating the existence of the SU Freshers Fair to Freshers and in organising guides and time slots for them.
 - **Complete lack of participation in the welfare element of Freshers week.** This is a violation of Standing Order 8.
 - **Failing to aid in the scheduling of the Angel Scheme**, and failing to attend any of the accompanying club nights despite having no collections.

- **Requesting that the Presidential Fleece reads “Top Shagger”** creating a potentially hostile environment for arriving Freshers costing the JCR an extra £120 to fix this and other errors.
- **Failure to communicate properly with College** about Freshers’ week. Communication with college is the whole point of electing a JCR President. He failed to do this which led to:
 - **No C-Bop in 0th week**, because of a failure to negotiate with college about hiring external and student bartenders.
 - **Failing to promptly reply to College about room bookings** for all of Fresher’s Week and causing lots of last minute room changes during the week, placing stress on Freshcom officers.
- 3. Substantial **failure in running of the JCR Committee**, because of repeated unprofessional and inattentive behaviour. This violates Standing Order 3 in the following ways:
 - Failure to **hold Officers to account for missing their JCR teas** in Trinity leading to a general breakdown in the system that was replaced ad hoc by officers and members of the committee who stepped up into his place.
 - Failure to **delegate and properly assign work in advance** to other officers, often communicating late into the night.
 - Lack of communication especially with his executive committee, demonstrated by his **over-reliance on previous JCR Presidents**, causing them to wield a disproportionate amount of power even after they left office. The dysfunction of the current executive committee has been widely noted by the JCR.
 - **The open and public criticism of JCR Officers** (whom he is responsible for) in a public setting (often the JCR itself), behind their backs, often over long periods, rather than dealing with it in a professional manner. This is a pattern where the President chooses not to speak directly to the person involved but to others in the JCR.
 - This is a violation of Presidential Standing Order 3 (an atmosphere of negativity harms the functioning of the JCR) Standing Order 16, and General Standing Order 9. The officers the **President has been verbally aggressive** about include but are not limited to:
 - Returning Officer (including the use of offensive, ableist language)
 - Former Returning Officer
 - Welfare Officer (Equalities)
 - Treasurer
 - Mental Health Rep (pre-Constitutional restructure)
 - Welfare Officer (Men’s)
 - Continually speaking to proposers to **undemocratically prevent** the issues of executive dysfunction raised above from **being raised in committee** as a motion in Trinity Term '24 which is a violation of General Standing Order 7.
- 4. **Lack of attendance to required sub-committees leading** to an ineffective running of the JCR, and no communication with the JCR members about these. Included are Library Committee, Academic Committee, Equal Opps Committee, among others. This can be demonstrated by the surprising lack of information in President Reports. This violates Standing Order 1 and 2.
 - **Particular note goes to the President’s failure to attend Ball Committee Meetings in Hilary and Trinity of 2024**, despite multiple requests for increased oversight by the JCR through various motions. The President’s intervention could have enabled a smoother run ball, with no charged alcohol and less logistical issues - addressing of key JCR concerns in the weeks preceding the Ball, particularly surrounding the lack of alcohol available.
 - It is also worth noting that the President repeatedly **fails to communicate promptly** with the JCR regarding **College’s response** when he is mandated to ask college committees about certain things via a motion. This is in violation of Section 16, Clause V.

“This JCR resolves to...”

- Make the **Vice President the chair for the JCR meeting of Week 2**, Michaelmas 2024 in accordance with Section 9 Clause I (f)
- Present a motion of no confidence against the JCR President, and hold the requisite by-election when the Returning Officer deems appropriate for handover purposes.

Proposer: *The Executive Committee (on behalf of anonymous proposer)*

Seconder: N/A

Short factual questions:

Jacob: We now hear short, factual questions about the motion. Because is an anonymous proposer, these questions go to Angelina, as the Chair of the motion. These questions must be short and factual: about the content of the motion from a facts-based perspective. Short, factual question - Rei.

Rei: So this is a very substantial list of allegations, I would like the Chair to go through all of these and to say from her point of view to say what are true and what are not.

Angelina: Okay. The first spending £185 on drinks without JCR approval of a monetary motion is true. Treya has the bank statements if needed.

Treya: Yes - if anyone wants further explanation of what happened. We passed a motion to spend £200 on Varsity bop. We spent £500 on booking the venue, the rest was to be made back by tickets. I agreed with Sam Newman, the Entz President, that any ticket revenue made above the £300 could be used to be paid over free drinks, I was told by the President around midnight that we had reached the required amount of tickets that meant that we had generated £200 more than the £300 figure (£500 total generated revenue from tickets). So I signed off on a £200 expenditure, later, I found out that we had only made £415 from the ticket revenue. This was £85 less than I had been informed, this was due to counting people in the bop physically rather than via the Fixr app. I also found that there was a £300 expenditure, £100 more than what I signed off on. Therefore the JCR spent a total of £385 on the Varsity Bop, £185 of which was unconstitutional. I really don't want to do this and I think that it will get nasty but I can show the messages regarding this conversation if anyone is interested.

Angelina: Number two, failure to coordinate FreshCom, failure to coordinate any FreshCom meeting in advance. As far as I am aware, we did not have any FreshCom meeting in Trinity, we had one in August, and the rest were in September which was probably two or three. There was an extremely delayed start of sales for Freshers club tickets.

Sam Moss: Sorry could you say a bit more about the things about like was there a reduced quality of experience? Because I feel like you can't measure that.

Angelina: Sorry I am currently answering what exactly he (*Elias*) did.

Sam Moss: Yeah but that is like something in the thing and none of us what that is about.

Hugo: Also, Angelina, it says that people couldn't buy tickets before Sunday of 0th week, has anyone here bought tickets for Freshers week before we arrived at uni?

Angelina: Can we wait for this for the debate?

Treya: This is currently short factual questions.

Hugo: Is it normal to buy them then? That seems pretty factual.

Treya: Last year, the tickets were released before Sunday of 0th week.

Several conflicting voices

Angelina: Can I please just go through the motion? Regarding no communication in advance for Freshers Week events to the JCR, with particular regard to subject drinks, I think this refers to the fact that subject

drinks was not publicised on the normal JCR Facebook page until the day of, including location which I think was not Elias' fault. But with the fact that it was not publicised, and many people in the other years were not back in college then because they did not know about it.

Elias: Can I clarify what the procedure is if I think that the Chair said something completely inaccurate? Even in these responses?

Jacob: I will check the procedure for a point of order.

Elias: Because the Freshers who are here can confirm that I told everyone that I saw in person in the room that I was at.

Angelina: This is referring to the rest of the JCR, not the Freshers.

Elias: It is also not my responsibility to organise subject drinks.

Several conflicting voices

Jacob: For everyone in the room, I will clarify the procedure for how we handle a short, factual question. Currently, Rei has asked a short, factual question. Angelina answers the question solely on the grounds that Rei has asked it. If there are any further short, factual questions by other members of the JCR, ask once Angelina has finished responding to Rei's factual question.

Sam Moss: Rei's question was is any of the things in the motion true...

Jacob: And, if you think that there should be more information provided, you can ask your own question, after Angelina has finished answering Rei.

Hugo: Is that not a bit illogical though?

Several conflicting voices

Hugo: She is talking way too much. She could just say "yes, no, yes, no".

Treya: That is the process.

Elias: Angelina does not have the information. These are all a matter of opinion in almost all these cases.

Treya: Then she will say that she doesn't know.

Angelina: If I don't know, then I will ask the rest of Exec who will probably know better.

Sam Newman: Can I clarify further about the £185 because I ran that event? So I'm the only person that knows exactly why that was spent and I think that it is ridiculous that I don't get to comment on that.

Jacob: You do, during debate.

Hugo: No, just do it now what is the problem?

Treya: Because that is not how it works.

Jacob: We have to follow the procedure.

Sam Moss: If you just let them speak...

Jacob: Yes, it will all be much faster without all the interruption – thank you.

Angelina: We are not really sure about the last-minute organisation of Freshers' Fair – as in the SU one. Failing to aid in the scheduling of the Angels Scheme...

Treya: This is true.

Angelina: Requiring that the presidential fleece reads 'Top Shagger', this is true.

(laughter from the room)

Hugo: Well, he didn't buy it himself.

Treya: I agree that this is really weird and I would like to clarify what had happened. And I am going to try get through this as fast as possible. So I asked everyone on committee, because - I don't know if you guys remember but - Miphram put Chancellor on his fleece, and we all thought that was cool, so I thought it would be nice for everyone on the committee the option to personalise the fleeces. So I asked them and sent them a form. There were a few concerns over some of the joke names submitted that I submitted to Exec, Angelina and Jacob okayed the list with a few changes. I waited a few days for Elias to respond but it was getting close to the time that I needed to order the fleeces by for them to arrive safely in time. About 2 • 5 weeks later, Elias asked about the fleece names on the chat and I reminded him that he had submitted 'top shagger' as his fleece name via the form. He then said, this was in jest, although he did not say that on the form. *(laughter from the room)* Can I finish? Since many of the names were in jest, for example, Michael submitted 'Corpus Pope' for Faith Rep. It was not clear which names were serious and which names were in jest, as a jest, or not as a jest, it was not clear. He then asked me to change this, and one other fleece. I then cancelled 2 of the existing fleeces ordered and then reordered two new fleeces to come in time, they did cost £120.

Angelina: Failure to communicate properly with college about Freshers' Week, no C-Bop in 0th week. I think that was...

Hugo: Uh actually...

Angelina: I haven't finished.

Hugo: Well, I want to speak as well.

Jacob: Hugo, stop speaking, please.

Angelina: The longer you interrupt the longer this meeting will be. So, the no C-Bop in 0th week was because of the fact that we did not have a bartender, this was explained to us over the summer. I don't think it was particularly related to Elias, or, if we did say in advance, that the outcome would have changed. Failing to promptly reply about room bookings: we did send an email out mid-August about room bookings with our whole provisional timetable. I don't know anything about last minute room-changes. Failure to hold officers on account for missing their JCR teas: also, I do not know. Open and public criticism of JCR officers, as far as I am aware, this is true to some extent that the President has been somewhat verbally aggressive about the listed officers.

Elias: Could the listed officers please clarify that? Given that some of them are in the room because multiple people have said specifically to me that these are, untrue and that they are unhappy with being listed in a motion that they were not consulted on.

Angelina: Part of the motion mentions it actually saying that it was said behind their backs, so they would not know.

Jacob: Point of order - Albert.

Albert: So, I heard something of that nature happen, so I spoke to Elias myself and we cleared up the misunderstanding and there is no more, issue so I don't know who submitted the motion but it seems that they may have heard that Elias said something about me and included my role in there and my name in there. But, just to clarify, there is no more issue about that misunderstanding.

Jacob: Point of order - Fionn.

Fionn: Same thing as Albert - I am listed on there, I don't think that it is appropriate for me to be on there, because I don't think that Elias has been aggressive to me.

Jacob: Point of order - Rei.

Rei: While we are going through this, I was the former Returning Officer, I never felt that I had been treated verbally aggressively by Elias so I'm confused why my name is on there.

Treya: I am refraining from commenting on this issue.

(brief silence)

Jacob: We should continue with Rei's question.

Angelina: Lack of attendance to the required subcommittee meetings, included are the Library Committee, Academic Committee, Equal Opps Committee, among others. Library Committee is, as far as I am aware, non-existent and has not been existent for like a while. Academic Committee, this was last week and I went instead of Elias, that is pretty standard for when the President can not attend the meeting. Equal Opps Committee, I think Fionn went?

Jacob: Point of order - Selina.

Selina: The College one? Elias was there. Or, if you mean the student one. then we thought there was no need for a meeting in person, and we organised everything on a chat. There was no need for Elias to turn up.

Angelina: Failure to attend Ball Committee meetings, Treya?

Jacob: Point of order - Treya.

Treya: Ok, yes, this is true. That is all I am going to say.

Angelina: That is about it from my side.

Jacob: Okay, are there any further short, factual questions? *(various members raise their hands)* I'm going to begin with Sam Moss.

Sam Moss: There's a few other sentences in there that I would love Angelina's opinion on whether that was true or not. Like, I feel like when they write that Elias has done something that caused a reduced quality of experience for people, the people should say like if they did have a reduced quality of experience or not. I feel like they shouldn't just write things like that down if there is nothing backing it up.

Angelina: I honestly don't know; I feel like a lot of it is speculative in the sense that you can't really know what it would have been like if it was all organised otherwise.

Sam Moss: But when you have a situation like Elias being verbally aggressive towards people and half of them have just said that he wasn't, then you kind of feel like maybe they have written a lot of stuff in there that are not true.

Jacob: This is short factual questions, and that is more debate. So, I will move to Freddie's short, factual question next.

Freddie Spence: Realistically, is there anything that Elias could have done to get more alcohol and is it not true that he did but the drinks company told him "no"?

Angelina: What is this referring to?

Freddie Spence: So, in terms of getting more alcohol at the ball, is there anything that Elias could have done to get more than 3000 drinks within the budget? And, second point, did he not buy the Lincoln alcohol?

Treya: No, I am so sorry, but that is not true. Ball Committee bought the Lincoln alcohol and Elias was not part of that decision. Second, yeah, I don't think anyone could've done anything to provide more alcohol at the Ball as I have made clear like very many times. The motion refers to him not attending Ball Committee meetings. I don't have anything to say about the implications of that; I was just clarifying that he did not attend them.

Elias: I attended some.

Treya: You attended 2 of the 18 that were held during your term.

Elias: Because I was specifically asked not to.

Treya: That is not true.

Jacob: Short factual question - Flore.

Flore: I just wanted to ask that Elias is the JCR President, not the Ball President, I was just wondering because I didn't know that the JCR President had to go to the Ball Committee meetings; is that a thing?

Jacob: I think that this question is my expertise, so Ball Committee has its own President, Secretary, and Treasurer. And, Elias is asked to attend, but it is ultimately up to the Ball Exec's decision whether he is necessary, required, or useful, and so should do so.

Treya: It is in the Standing Orders to attend.

Jacob: The Ball Exec can overrule that.

Treya: To be clear, we have never asked Elias to not attend

Jacob: Short factual question - Manelle.

Manelle: So I just wanted to clarify what Treya said initially with the first point, because it was a bit confusing - the way it was explained - at first, to me at least. So, Elias was informed that he could fund the free drinks, you informed him that he could fund the free drinks and then you found out from Sam that that wasn't actually the case?

Treya: I can explain it again. That is fair that it was confusing; I was also confused. So, I agreed with Sam that we would fund any extra money that we made over the ticket or the cost of the venue into free drinks.

I was told by the President at around midnight that we had hit the number of tickets which meant that we had generated £200 above the break-even number. Is that clear?

Manelle: Yes.

Treya: So, then I said “ok, spend the £200”. Then, he spent £300, and then I found out that we hadn’t actually hit that number; we had hit a number lower than that.

Manelle: But it says that he spent £185, not £300.

Treya: He spent £300 out of which I had originally approved £200. And then we found out that we were actually £115 over the break-even number, which means that £185 of the £300 spent was unconstitutional.

Manelle: To clarify, you okayed the spending of the money?

Treya: I okayed the spending of any money over the limit of the break-even point. I didn’t okay the spending of arbitrary amount of JCR money. I generally don’t do that. I did not sanction the £185 that was unconstitutional. I sanctioned only the amount that was above ticket break-even point, as I agreed with Sam Newman.

Manelle: I mean when you were under the pretence that you were above the threshold such that he could?

Treya: Yeah, so then I okayed £200, a total of £300 was spent on the card on drinks.

Manelle: Not £185?

Treya: No, £300.

Angelina: The £185 is the net loss from the £300 spent plus the revenue costs from the ticket sales.

Treya: £300 total was spent: £115 was profit, £185 was just JCR money.

Jacob: Short factual question - Sam Newman

Sam Newman: So I ran that event...

Jacob: Is this a factual question?

Sam Neman: When can I talk about what happened?

Angelina: During the debate.

Jacob: We have questions, then debate. Short factual question - Manelle.

Manelle: I just wanted to gain clarity, as to who approved the designs on the back of the fleeces?

Treya: So the Officers submitted their options to me, I then sent those names to Angelina, Jacob, and Elias on our group chat. Angelina and Jacob signed off; can I finish speaking?

Manelle: Yeah, yeah, I wasn’t talking to you.

Treya: Ok cool, Angelina and Jacob approved it and then I waited a couple days for Elias to respond. He did not respond.

Jacob: He was on a boat, to clarify.

Elias: With no Wi-Fi, for more clarification. And the Exec were informed of this 3 days before

Treya: What?

Elias: Yes, I put a message on the group chat saying: “I’m going on a boat, I will not have Wi-Fi for 5 days”, that is when the decision was made.

Treya: Ok. Anyways they said that it was ok and I waited for Elias and then two and a half weeks after this he said: what’s up with the fleeces, I said I ordered them then the concern was raised.

Manelle: Can I just ask a follow up question?

Treya: Yeah.

Manelle: So when you read “top shagger”, you felt as though you needed Elias to clarify what that meant? So you didn’t take the initiative to maybe think about it?

Treya: I did, which is why I submitted it to the executive committee group chat.

Jacob: This sounds like more debate than factual so I will move this debate for later.

Manelle: I can make it factual.

Treya: It’s fine.

Jacob: Okay, carry on.

Manelle: No, no, wait, sorry, so just you used your initiative, considered that ‘top shagger’ was not a joke, and then approved the designs of the fleece. Because it almost sounds to me as though...

Treya: Can I respond?

Manelle: Yeah no, can I finish?

Treya: Oh ok.

Manelle: It almost sounds to me like it was done intentionally, perhaps to get Elias into this situation in the first place. So can you just clarify what you think ‘top shagger’ means and why you think that that’s appropriate?

Michael: Sounds like a bit of a stretch

Treya: Ok, so there were two fleeces, it wasn’t just Elias’ fleece and I don’t want to bring the second Officer into it. All of the names submitted were joke names: I can tell you the other joke names. Lots of them were ridiculous, there are many examples of this. Also, I didn’t think that only Elias would be the only person to submit his name as a joke. Everyone submitted like funny names, but that they wanted.

Jacob: For example, mine is a joke name. This is a joke. It says “constitutional oracle” (*on the fleece that Jacob is wearing*), which is a joke.

Sam Moss: That is hilarious.

Treya: And, I completely understand this concern with the informal nature of the name. I shared those concerns. That is why I sent the names to the Exec group chat, saying “are we ok with this?”.

Manelle: And so everyone said that they were ok with it?

Jacob: Yes, we three did.

Manelle: I thought that Elias was on a boat.

Jacob: It was the three here (*Angelina, Jacob, and Treya*).

Manelle: Oh right and none of you thought that 'top shagger' was a joke?

Treya: If the President submits something themselves, I tend not to try question the President's decision.

Manelle: Sorry, ok I think I've heard everything that I needed to hear.

Jacob: I'm going to take Hugo's point, then the question from JJ.

Hugo proposes a Procedural Motion to vote.

Jacob: Hugo has raised a Procedural Motion. It is a Procedural Motion to hold a vote on the motion immediately. This is a vote on skipping all remaining questions and skipping debate, and voting immediately. We can hear a speech in favour first.

Speech in favour (Hugo):

Elias isn't going to get no-conned, like it isn't going to happen. We have already been here for 45 minutes discussing one thing; it's a waste of time. Elias is a good president, we are going to vote against it, any debate is just an echo chamber. Everyone disagrees with it.

Speech against (Rei):

The motion, when it was first submitted, was a bit concerning. However, hearing what Elias did in the executive meetings almost trying to suppress this motion, I am now less certain that I am going to vote against this motion. At least, I would like to have clarification on what happened there and I think that people would want to say things as well.

Jacob: Procedural Motions have priority over other business, so we will hold this vote now.

JJ: Can I say my question?

Elias: Can I answer Rei's question, because it has been just now?

Jacob: The nature of this motion is to hold a vote immediately. If it fails, then you can all speak.

Vote:

For: 8

Against: Overwhelming

Abstain: N/A

Procedural motion fails

Jacob: The motion fails. Short factual question - JJ.

JJ: I have a question for the committee generally, I'd like to ask did you speak to Elias multiple times on every single one of these occasions because I would like to ask if he missed one meeting, did you inform him? And if he missed a second one, did you inform him as well? I just want to clarify.

Angelina: Ok, I'm going to speak with regard to FreshCom, because that is when I started my term, it was the first thing I did when I started my term as Vice-President. We have a group chat for FreshCom and a group chat for exec. On both chats, Treya and I have both repeatedly asked Elias over the summer that we should organise meetings as soon as possible so that we can give people as much time as possible or as much time as they need to organise whatever events, know what events they need to organise, where etc. to figure out all the details. Technically, I think, we should have had a meeting in Trinity in person anyways. Or, that was what traditionally was done. The first meeting we had was mid-August, which was already delayed. And as Exec, we decided that it would also be best to, from that point onwards, have weekly meetings with various people. We set out a time, which was every Saturday at 2pm BST, which is what worked best for the different time zones. We agreed with every Saturday at 2pm, from that Saturday onwards, we calculated 7 or 8. Of those 7 or 8, we had 2. And we didn't have a full FreshCom meeting either, right before Freshers' Week. That is going off of what I have done or know about what we should've done for FreshCom.

Jacob: Point of order - Elias.

Elias: In terms of college meetings, I have never missed a meeting without apologies.

Treya: What? Why is he?

Jacob: It's a point of order.

Elias: The only meeting that I have missed, so I have missed two, both of them were this term. The first was not a miss, it was sending Angelina which is something that I can constitutionally do, and is really often done. This is not a full-time job, I am not expected to be at every meeting. The second one that I missed was because I was working, and I missed a welfare lunch. Fionn was present and another invitee of the welfare lunch. It was a very poorly attended lunch anyway. I gave my apologies.

Jacob: Short factual question - Ben.

Ben Wharton: Can I ask for further clarification on what happened between when this motion was submitted to Jacob and this meeting happening right now?

Jacob: Ok, I can give quite a long summary of what happened. This motion was sent to me as RO, at five to midnight on Friday. I was asleep then. I awake on Saturday, see the motion in my inbox, and tell Exec that there has been a no-con against Elias. We have an Exec meeting with the four of us, in Elias' room because Exec must decide, on any no-con, if there is enough ground to proceed to a meeting. We discuss the motion, and obviously Elias is recused, being the subject of the motion, so the rest of executive, that is these three (*Jacob, Treya, Angelina*), agree that there is enough ground to raise this motion at this JCR meeting. Elias made it known and wanted it noted that it was the wrong decision in his point of view. We then break apart. I talk with others in College. Later, Elias asked me to potentially withdraw the motion on various grounds, not strictly constitutional, and I said that this was a bad idea for various reasons. At this point, I believe Elias spoke to members of College staff about this from a welfare point of view: what this meant in terms of his welfare and the atmosphere in College generally. We were also concerned, that is the three of us (*Jacob, Treya, Angelina*), about these welfare concerns. We therefore asked the proposer of this motion to potentially edit it to make it more welfare-friendly. What you are seeing currently on your devices and which has been read out is the edited version. The proposer constitutionally can do this. This has happened on numerous, past occasions. The proposer, incidentally, had written to me independently to alter the tone and asked to amend it, so this was a simultaneous event that happened. It was therefore amended and there was a new motion that I had on my iPad,. At this point there was an official complaint by Elias about this proposer, the motion, and the welfare thereof., alleging bullying and harassment or something similar to that. And, I was asked to convey to the proposer, that the complaint would be withdrawn, if and only if the proposer apologised in person and withdrew the motion. The proposer did not decide to do so. After this, I released to the mailing list the new version of the motion

having been edited. And, Elias mentioned that he was not certain that this version to be submitted than the earlier version. I had submitted the later version, following the common constitutional rule about this. Later, the motion was released from the mailing list and Elias was quite angry about this happening, and posted in our group chat, that we have as Exec, a message stating his displeasure with this result. Are there any further questions on the course of events that I can help to answer?

Talia: Earlier you said that he wanted the angrier version, the original version, because it was more pragmatic. Could you explain why that might be more pragmatic?

Elias: Could I please clarify why I wanted this? I wasn't sure. What happened was I asked for in the group chat, I said "guys can you give me five minutes to think about this". And that was read by members of exec and sent out anyways, which I thought was quite upsetting because I wasn't told that this was going to happen. So, my reasoning was this. My main concern with this motion, essentially, although there are several, most of it being that it is deeply inaccurate, is also there is a, especially the first version, was very, very obviously a targeted personal attack. My feeling was that if the entire JCR was to see a refined version, which was made after a long time of processing and deliberation, it would not give the, - it would not explain sufficiently my welfare concerns, as it will be presented to you when I am given the opportunity to speak to you about this motion. And it would therefore not make sense. However, this is not me making that decision, it was also my understanding, Jacob was saying now and I believe that he is right, about any amendments that can be made after. Because my understanding was that amendments could only be made with presidential approval. So my understanding was that that was a choice that I could make and it was not clarified to me that this was not the choice that I could make. So, I thought this was something that I was allowed to do, it was then taken out of my hands, and so I was not happy about that. But then essentially "I said fine, it's happened now".

Jacob: Short factual question - Oskari.

Oskari: Has the anonymity process measures of a no-confidence motion been respected? i.e. Has Elias tried at any point to find out who the proposer is?

Jacob: The no-con motion is anonymous, and so only I and the submitter know who it is. Elias did not ask me who it was. We have had meetings one on one; he did not ask me to tell me who it was. There was speculation, but there was never an attempt to coerce me into saying who it was. Short factual question - Sam Newman.

Sam Newman: This is coming from the perspective of a pretty high-ranking JCR Officer. *(applause from the room)*

Jacob: Is this a question?

Sam Newman: It is a question, with pretext. All Freshers have entered this thing in like chapter 94 and we had a very similar thing last year where we had a no-con motion full of personal grievances. And I came to stick my neck out because I don't stand for Sarahah in the JCR. Most of us know what was in this no-con motion, this is Corpus and we all talk to each other, so why was another motion with so many unfound personal grievances get past the first stage of approval from Exec? Why did we not learn anything from last time?. It is the same as last time and as a high ranking officer it scares me that such a personal attack could get through a public platform that is meant to be serving the JCR

Jacob: this is a constitutional question so I will answer it. Our procedure from the motion to the meeting, is not based in anything other than if there is at least one ground in the motion that would constitute a potentially no-connable offence. That is to say that if we isolate everything apart from the most persuasive argument, to think in isolation, could this be a no-connable offence. And, there was in the motion a reasonable ground to think that at least one thing in there was true and could amount to a no-connable offence. That was our procedure for doing so. Now we have spoken to College staff about this; we are

considering a new procedure going forwards involving the Dean more heavily. Short, factual question - Catrina.

Catrina: Just to clear the air about any speculation, can you confirm that nobody on Exec submitted it?

Jacob: Yes, the one thing I can confirm, and the one thing I know for a certainty, is that nobody on Exec, as in anyone on this bench currently, had any hand in planning, writing, or indeed doing anything on the motion for its submission. Short, factual question - Freddie.

Freddie Spence: If you found one thing in the motion, and the rest of it as pretty personal grievances, why have you just allowed this person to throw things at Elias when only one or two things actually have grounds?

Jacob: This is why we are changing the procedure, That was the operating procedure at that time.

Freddie Spence: Fine.

Jacob: Short factual question.

Name unknown: Is there any reason, under the constitution of the JCR, why we would not have been able to see both motions?

Jacob: Elias could share that older version if Elias wants to. That's not my prerogative, so he can message it, email it, text it as he wants.

Elias: I have shared it with a couple people. Basically the first motion against me contains so much slander and is actually such a personal attack that I don't really want it to be something that people can just download freely, which is why I think that I would have probably chosen not to go with that because I would be very uncomfortable with the level of baseless accusations in that one. I am still uncomfortable with the level of baseless accusations in this one, but it is not as egregious. However, there are I think very relevant bits which in my speech I'm going to read out because I think that they demonstrate the tone and the approach and the intentions of the proposer who is bringing this motion forward because they are very personal and completely irrelevant: defamations of character.

Jacob: Short, factual question.

Name unknown: Just a question on something that happening over the summer, there seems to be a lot of unsaid subtext about the tensions within the group. And the relationships between the president and the committee, is there anything that is going unsaid that we as Freshers don't know maybe about elections that happened last year or some personal grievances and dislikes that really we wouldn't know about. We have only been here for 13 days but it feels like it's a very hostile environment. It's very confusing.

Jacob: That's a very fair question.

Treya: We don't have any personal grievances

Jacob: Okay. In Trinity Term of last year, there was a quite publicised dispute, of which many people were aware, among the Executive. This was ostensibly resolved last year and since then, we have had what I thought, from my perspective, was a very cordial working relationship. I am not aware since Trinity Term last year of there being any long-standing grievances between any of us.

Angelina: And for context, Jacob and I are new from mid-Trinity to the Exec.

Jacob: I am not new; you're new.

Angelina: I know, and before that he was Vice-President but since mid-Trinity Jacob has been RO and I've been RO. Treya and Elias have been in their Exec roles since the beginning of Hilary of last year.

Jacob: Short, factual question - Arian.

Arian: Just to clarify, did Elias make a complaint to the Dean because of this motion?

Jacob: Yes.

Arian: And then just to clarify again, based on what you said before, did he then basically say that he would withdraw that complaint if that person showed themselves in person to apologise?

Jacob: It was the external complaint that he would withdraw.

Elias: Could I say why that happened?

Jacob: You can say what happened, not why.

Elias: I said originally that I would consider withdrawing it if the motion. When Jacob came to me to say that the person was making edits for welfare reasons, I said that I'm not really sure how helpful that would be to my welfare or anyone else's. And so I basically said look, if this person wants to withdraw this motion, I will think about withdrawing my complaint. And I then said that I would withdraw my complaint if that person comes and apologises to me in person and withdraws the motion.

Arian: Is that not maybe in your opinion trying to figure out who that person is? Or a little bit intimidatory?

Jacob: It could be intimidatory, I don't think that it was intended to find out whom it was it was, but it could be viewed as being threatening or intimidation. That is one interpretation of that event.

Elias: What?

Jacob: It could be viewed by somebody in that way. Short, factual question - JJ.

JJ: I would just like to ask how many of the things on the list that was read out earlier do you think are more JCR committee issues rather than the blame being solely on Elias.

Jacob: This is certainly true. The JCR Committee has various ambits for each role. In the broad constitutional sense, the President oversees everyone, which in practice is impossible. There is no clear dividing line but most of the things on there are more to Officers individually than Elias as a whole. Are there any further short, factual questions? Anyone? Okay, we now move to debate. We will first hear a speech by Elias. Elias, you have the floor.

Debate:

Elias: Hi everyone, I think the main thing that I have to say has already been spoken about. But, my sense of the motion is that it has been made in an incredibly personal play, which is why I have taken it to the dean and to the formal welfare complaint, on the advice of the President of the College. I have done so because I feel that the tone and the repeated lying of very serious nature that is involved in this motion is essentially being done to actively cause my reputation in this College damage, especially with the group of the new Freshers who do not know me very well. And I think that even just by emailing something of this fashion gives it legitimacy to allegations that are completely untrue in almost every case. I think that I would actually like to clarify, like I said, referencing the original of this. And for clarification of how much of the content of this motion was not only strange but also clearly not related to JCR functions and is just odd. I would like to read just this one little particularly strange bit: "during the creation of the Freshers' Welcome Packs, the president showed a heightened interest in ensuring that there are condoms in the

packs with remarkable enthusiasm when compared to his other activities for FreshCom. Whilst it is not a standing order violation per se, this is an odd and anti-welfare attitude to take. The president should know and do better". There is also a claim, among other things, that I like the smell of dirty laundry, *(laughter from the room)* so I would like to clarify both these things. I have spoken to a bunch of people who were there in the room when we were putting condoms in the Freshers packs, which is what happens every single time and seems pretty good for welfare, we don't really want Freshers to get Syphilis. But also no one has any idea what this heightened thing was. I don't know either and I don't really care. I similarly don't really love the smell of dirty laundry. While that stuff is quite funny, the tone of this is actually very serious. Because what has been done here is some very deliberate lying, including some really serious allegations, which if they were true would fall under the discipline and harassment policy about me which are made to make me look like a really bad President and a really bad person - to be honest - in front of all of you and the entire College. Because there will be people not in this room who would not get to hear this defence, who would not get to hear a lot of the other voices that you have already heard, saying that this stuff is untrue, and who will read this and say "wow, he sounds like a terrible person; this is grim". And I would hope that none of you would think this about me and I would hope that it is being presented as quite a clear personal grievance. I am happy to go through every point in the way that Angelina has done and give you my perspective on it. I think that there is no real need to do that because I think that so much of this is personalised, but I will answer any questions and I will a couple of broad things though on the topics that have been discussed. So I think the main one about the spending of £185. Look: this was a mistake but this was a very easy one to make. The communication with Treasurer was that I could spend the money. I spent the wrong amount of money and that was my mistake but not an intentional one, there was a misunderstanding on my part of how much money there was to spend and also how many of those tickets had been sold, because I was literally at the door counting how many people would go through and clearly my maths isn't as good as I thought it was. But ultimately, these are not the drinks that I bought for myself. I want to make this very clear. What happened was we had advertised an event that would have drinks tokens, if you come in. So, we then arrived at midnight at this point and nobody got any drinks tokens, and so I made a panic decision and I just touched the JCR card on the reader that had been done and I only realised that I had spent £100 over afterwards. And then those drinks tokens were distributed to students evenly and in the way that had been agreed. If my crime is spending £100 on JCR drinks for people in the JCR as they were advertised, then fair enough. I think that that was in the main topic of conversation. The stuff about Freshers' Week, my sense and the sense of the entire Committee when we had a Committee Meeting earlier today was that Freshers' Week went incredibly well, one of the best attended Freshers' Weeks that we have ever had. We've got some Freshers in the room, hopefully you guys thought that it was good. If you don't, I'm really sorry but we hope that it was good, we tried really hard. This thing about needing a meeting in Trinity is like why? It is four months before, I don't really think that's that necessary. Yes it has been done before, I chose not to do it. I would also like to clarify that a lot of the things that this motion is asking me to do kind of assumes that I am terrible at my job and disorganised and lazy and all these things when I would also like to clarify this that this is not a full-time job and yet in the last 2 weeks alone I have put in over 90 hours of work on the JCR. I would like to ask how many other people have this to spare because if the no-con is passed against me, you will need a replacement. This is the kind of commitment this takes and this is a part-time, unpaid student role. I cannot be in every committee, and I cannot oversee every JCR Officer doing their job at all times. The vast majority of the specific things that are actively in this motion which are not just slander or just weird are things which are, to be honest, not my primary responsibility. And also those things that they are saying that went terribly and I think went quite well. Subject drinks is an example, the Freshers who were there, we had loads of Freshers, we had loads of second years, we had loads of third years, I thought that that was pretty good. But that's not my job. Georgia and the Access Officer from the College organises it. *(applause to Georgia and the Access Officer from the room)* I think this has caused me really significant emotional distress, I would like to highlight that. The reason that I have been having these meetings with College is because the idea of something like this being sent around about you in College is a distinctly terrifying thing. And no one has put their name to it which makes it even more terrifying because it kind of breeds a paranoia where I don't want to believe that it is anyone but someone has done it and clearly has a real issue with me. This is why I have chosen to report it to the disciplinary team in the way that I have done. I think that a lot of the allegations here are, quite frankly, not the business of the JCR to be discussing, even things about personal relations between members of the JCR. If there are

issues between relations of the JCR, they should be taken to the dean, they should be taken to the welfare team, they should be taken to the relevant members in college. If you turn it into kind of like a vote where people decide who has been a shit bloke and who has been a good bloke, that is not helpful to anyone. And, I don't think that this is the appropriate way in which some of the more serious complaints which I believe to be baseless and you have heard a lot of them being baseless from the people who they are meant to be about. Even if there are legitimate complaints there, and if there are then I am really sorry but I don't think there are. They should please be handled in the professional way which is to go through College and to go through the disciplinary procedures. Instead of having Jacob have to email around to 200 people a motion which says in really really specific and in some ways very persuasive language, especially if you don't know the background to all of these, that I am a terrible person who has done some really quite nasty things. For those reasons, please be careful about the way that this is spoken about today and it is not exclusively my welfare that is up to play but there are a lot of other people who are mentioned in this motion without being consulted. Please have them in mind. My final thing is about the Freshers, I am particularly upset about this motion because this is not what the JCR is about. We have not had to have the Dean in a JCR meeting for at least as long as I have been here but I think something like ten to fifteen years. This is not what the JCR is about. The things that the JCR and the JCR meetings are meant to be about are what is coming after: the fun stuff, like where we talk about where we spend money or do we want longer rent contracts to actually speak to College about who wants to stay longer but we might have to pay a bit more. These are useful discussions. These are discussions that makes everyone's lives better. This type of politics thing is unhelpful. I think that is all I have to say, I am happy to answer any kind of questions pretty much. Obviously anything crazy, I won't. But any vaguely respectful questions I am happy to answer as best as I can. I don't know whether I am allowed to take questions.

Jacob: The Chair will handle it. Debate - Fionn.

Fionn: I would like to preface this by saying that I do think this motion and unsubstantiated dogshit. but, do you have anything to comment on the fact that you were specifically accused of saying ableist things against the Returning Officer Jacob and also talking about people behind their backs. And whether you think that that is substantiated in any fashion.

Elias: Yeah, in terms of the ableist comments about Jacob, the nature of this comment that Jacob was told that had been said to Jacob, Jacob does not remember having been said by me. I don't think I've said it and Jacob told me at least that he doesn't think that I have said it to him.

Jacob: Yes, there was a comment that the proposer emailed to me that was said apparently by Elias to or about me. I have not heard this comment. Obviously, I cannot hear everything in the whole world, but I have not heard this as far as I am aware

Elias: I would also like to clarify the initial wording of this motion made it clear that that was a comment that was directly said to Jacob Harvey. Which means that if that was not said to Jacob Harvey, yes it now sounds like it could be something that I have said behind his back, it wasn't but even if it had been that is not what the proposer was saying initially. This motion has been amended significantly and this is part of my discomfort with the way that this motion has been amended. Is that it makes it sound much more, like you can't prove a negative, it is very difficult to prove that I didn't say these kind of things, but it was initially said that I said this to Jacob. I think that Jacob saying that I did not say this to Jacob and me saying that I did not say this to Jacob. Hopefully, that answers your question. In terms of talking about people behind their back, look I try and do that minimally. I will not lie and say that I have never spoken about people behind their back, because I would also like to say that this is my professional space and in my JCR presidency have to take it professionally. But it is also my personal space; it is also my social space. I think that anyone who has done a job before has bitched about their co-workers to their friends before. This kind of thing happens. I try and not do it, I have had occasions, considering the incredibly stressful term and year that we have had, I am not proud of it. I should not have done that, but ultimately that is what has happened. I am not going to deny it completely, although I think that it is over-exaggerated in this motion. I have, but I don't think that it is, it is also my social space, I have no other outlet. This is a very very difficult job to do for that reason. I try and balance everyone's interests. There are times where

I am having a terrible day, and that that might come across in the wrong way. And for anyone that happened to, I apologise but I don't think that that's a common thing and I also don't think that that's an unusual thing. I think its fair to say, I love Isaac and Will the last two JCR Presidents, I don't think it is particularly out of keeping with the conduct of the last two JCR Presidents. Maybe others might disagree. I just think that it is part of the role with student politics where the people that you are working with and for are also the people that are your friends and that can kind of have a moan to. I think that it is an inevitable tension. That's that.

Jacob: Debate - JJ.

JJ: Obviously, I'm a Fresher, so I don't really know how things work. when you guys are organising Freshers' Week and things like that. For me personally, I did feel like that perhaps Freshers' Week wasn't advertised as much. I feel like only the people who were on that chat which wasn't everyone which meant that you didn't really have a way of knowing. Lots of people didn't really know what was going on, that weren't on that chat. So I would've liked to see a timetable or a bit more advertisement or something like that. Also, when I spoke to my friends in other Colleges, I found that they had non-drinking events on and quite a lot of people, although I suppose that there probably was a large turnout for people in Plush and Glamorous and Bridge and stuff, I think that quite a lot of people would've appreciated some non-drinking events. I don't know whether- I don't know whose responsibility that was but for me personally as a Fresher in Freshers' Week I would've liked more activities that weren't really just drinking.

Jacob: I'll take another point of debate, then Elias can respond to both, in the interest of time.

Name unknown: This is just a question regarding your future in your role, so, obviously, there is a bit of tension between you and your committee,. Do you feel like if you were voted to continue in that role, you would be able to effectively carry out your job?

Elias: Ok so I will answer that question first, because it is very easy. Look, I won't lie that there was some tension at the end of last term. In my view, it was resolved. It is resolved, because I know that none of the Committee members had any role in writing this. Therefore, I have no issue with anyone on this bench or anyone on my Committee. I pretty much like everyone in College; that's why I am so confused by this, because I thought I had pretty good relations with everyone in College. Yes, I am more than happy to keep doing my role as I have done before

Jacob: I agree that Exec could work with Elias.

Elias: JJ, in response to what you were saying about Freshers' Week. Look, I am really, really sorry that you didn't have the best Freshers' Week experience. There were non-alcoholic events and we tried to ensure that there was one every day. In terms of the advertising, I think one of the mistakes that I did make and that I am fully aware of is that, when I advertised it, because I did send around an email with the full timetable - and it was also on the Facebook, both the Freshers' Facebook and the non-Freshers' Facebook - I think when I emailed it, I had to email it as like seven images. Theywere all in one email, but it meant that it was quite easy to miss or forget about. That was literally just because I didn't have a better way of doing it and that was because the only way that the timetable would have been designed was in the photos. And I agree, we have a perennial challenge of organising and advertising these things better, and if the non-drinking events were poorly advertised, then that is really useful feedback that we can use and we can pass on from next Committee. But I would like to say that non-drinking events were actually a specific focus of ours in the planning of these meetings. That is the responsibility of the entirety of FreshCom to organise and make sure that they are all well-organised. As the head of it, I take responsibility for that and it's really useful feedback. We will be sending out an email form for feedback about Freshers' Week which we really appreciate. Comments like that are really helpful for us going forward, it is something which clearly we need to work on.

Angelina: One thing that I will say about this is that we as FreshCom and definitely Elias as well, thought that at multiple times that we need to do a lot of non-drinking events. And I think that, timetable-wise, we

thought that there was enough, but we are sorry that there weren't. I know that Elias was definitely very adamant that there were regularly non-drinking events and made sure that it would be more publicised and more of a common thing, not just focusing on drinking events

Sam Newman: I don't know if I am allowed to speak.

Jacob: You are. Debate - Sam Newman.

Sam Newman: Because I also organised a lot of Freshers' Week. So, you may not know what happened last year's Freshers' Week. Basically I would say that it is very difficult to cater for what Freshers are going to come because we don't know you guys or anything. Last year, we had extremely low attendance at all bops and twilight teas and that year was just a very highly non-drinking year. And I think that it is very difficult to make sure that every single year has the same kind of attendance for different types of events. Like your year has had the highest attendance for all of the drinking events that we have ever seen, ever. C-bop was full and I think that it is maybe slightly unfortunate for non-drinkers that your year just happens to be that kind of year. But there is a massive change. There is a huger change. We had a very similar timetable last year, if not basically the same timetable last year, but the attendance was very enormously low. We had like 5 people go to the C-bop, well not like 5, but not many more people were there at the bop last year. I think that the JCR cannot completely account for that as a whole

Elias: It is also worth clarifying that some of our non-drinking events were also really well attended. For example, Alts was the best attended that I have ever seen it. the Games Night, some of it was drinks adjacent. We love the Freshers; we have been talking about that since the day you have arrived. (*applause from the room*) We love you guys, you're doing a sick job. Some of you love the sesh and some of you love the other stuff and we respect that as well. We love it. Come to JCR events. They're fun and they do run through term. Ok now this is shameless; I'm gonna move on. We also did have some non-drinking events which we thought were really well attended, like I say, I hear what you are saying with problems in advertising, I think that there is always a problem and this runs throughout the term as well. And how you advertise things to the JCR as well: some people like really late notice, some people like to know what's happening well in advance. And then some people like to get it in different ways, some people like the Facebook, some people like the Instagram posts, some people like the emails. It is very complicated to organise how best to advertise. We did it as best we could through emails, through Facebook, and through the WhatsApp. But I realise that some of that stuff was slipped through and not everyone that would've been involved would've seen all that stuff. And for those people we are really sorry. We are always thinking about how we can better advertise events.

Rei: I have got a few good things and a few bad things to say. Let's start off with the bad things first. Firstly, I know Elias you disagree almost entirely with the content. However, some of these things are true that should be taken into account. The other thing I'd say is that the handling of the no-con should not be excused from discussion. I think it stops, you know, impressions that you were trying to suppress the no-con and I think that this has cleared up a few things. So that is my criticisms here. But on the other side, you know I think that Elias has been a great President, had a lot of difficult times and pressures, for those that don't know about last year. And there are many things that I don't recognise or I don't believe are true. Yeah, that's about it.

Elias: Thank you for your kind words, it's always nice, but also in terms of the two things that you were saying. I think that, especially in terms of the second one - I think in terms of the handling with exec - so, I did recuse myself, so that decision was left to those three (*Angelina, Jacob, Treya*). They then held a meeting without me. I thought that it was fair given that it was about me and that I am a member of Exec, that I could at least voice my thoughts first but we were very clear that there was a separation between the decision-making...

Jacob: May I interject and say that you should have waited to be acknowledged by the Chair before debating?

Elias: Yeah, that's fair. Angelina, may I?

Angelina nods.

Elias: My view was it's fair to kind of say my piece and my view of why I do think that this motion should've been rejected, if it is rejected that is not just like the motion is done by the way, if the person who is rejected by is then well within their rights to then go and make a petition on the Corpus Facebook page., Which then if that gets forty signatures or any other way, then that can still go to motion. So that would not have been just me suppressing it anyway but I thought that it was unfair as well for me to have a vote in that or for me to be privy to the discussions where they decided that that's fair. Therefore I left. Well, they were in my room, so I kicked them out of my room so that they could have a conversation among themselves in private. I would also like to say that a lot of the reasoning that I was given at least given at the time was the consistency with other JCR motions that have happened in the past and also the second explanation that I was given at least and maybe this is different to what Jacob said today, and the information that Jacob has said today makes sense. The second explanation that I was given was that if these allegations were true, then there would be grounds. And that's what I was expressing my disagreement with, was that I don't think you can just throw stuff at the wall and say "oh if this stuff was true it would be really bad and then we would have to talk to the JCR about it", because the JCR isn't the arbitrator of what's true and what's not. Those were my reasoning for objecting, those were different reasons to those that Jacob has provided today. And I want you to know that these were also concerns raised by exec. And I am not saying that Jacob is trying to mislead you in any way as to what Exec's decision-making process was - I fully respect that. Once that decision was made I did not try to interfere other than on the welfare grounds that were spoken about with College. I would like to make it very clear that I did not try and suppress this motion. I was just very worried about the impression it painted both to Freshers who don't know me very well and also because this kind of thing has very serious implications to my own welfare. And I was trying to make sure that those things were being considered. I would like to think that I did not step out of line in doing so.

JJ: I just have another question considering I genuinely don't really know how the JCR works and stuff so this is a genuine question that probably should've come earlier but I've only thought of it now. If Elias is voted to step down as President, does he still get to be on Committee?

Jacob: This is to me, as it's a constitutional question. Right, if Elias were to be no-conned, Angelina, as Vice-President, would become President immediately. Elias would have no more role in the JCR. he would become not any Officer at all, not a Rep, not a role-holder, just a normal person as many of you are here today. At that point, we have to appoint a Vice-President, who will be in the role temporarily until the election of week 7. In week 7, of this term, on Thursday, there are the general Michaelmas Term elections. We would then elect a new JCR President and Treasurer, and other roles. And, Angelina will go back to being Vice-President.

Elias: To clarify also, this is my last term anyways, so those elections will take place in Michaelmas...

Jacob: There's another point of debate to hear first.

Arian: Just to obviously give Elias a chance to defend himself, what was your reasoning behind asking the proposer to come to you directly and showing his face and apologising, and on that basis you revoke the complaint to the Dean? What was like the kind of reasoning behind that? Why did you do that?

Elias: Look: I think quite simply because it really ruined my day and I don't - you know - I think a lot of what is going on here is that someone is to be honest is using the anonymity. So, for the level of anonymity this has taken., I think that this is quite relevant information, this is not just initially submitted anonymously to Jacob and Jacob was asked to reveal who it was. Someone went through the effort of creating an extra email address...

Jacob: No, you can't say that.

Elias: Am I not allowed to say that?

Jacob: It is about the anonymous proposer, so no.

Elias: Oh, but it is about their anonymity.

Jacob: It is not allowed; it is not constitutional for you to say that.

Elias: Oh ok. I'm sorry.

Fresher Ben: Well you already said it so...

(laughter from the room)

Elias: Ok I am actually sorry. I don't think that it gives their identity away.

Jacob: It doesn't. For context, only I know who it is.

Elias: To return to the question at hand though, I thought that it was fair given that it caused me a huge amount of grief. If I was then to withdraw my welfare concern which was on very serious grounds and was recommended to me by College, I didn't think that simply withdrawing it was sufficient because it caused me a huge amount of pain. You might disagree with that as an approach. I wasn't sure about it myself at the time but I thought that it was fair that someone who I think has used a JCR levy or JCR method to bully me and cause me a massive amount of shame in front of the entire JCR should apologise. If they were to decide that it was fitting and if they were worried about the welfare complaints as Jacob told me. That was my view, if you disagree, totally fine. That was my reasoning.

Arian: So just for my understanding, they have gone through all of that to make sure that it is all anonymous, and their name not to be revealed to the JCR, do you then think that what you did with them was then appropriate to try and get them to approach you and ensure that they...?

Elias: I didn't say. I have never even asked this to be communicated to this person, I simply told this to Jacob. I think. I'm not 100% sure. But even if that's not true, no, look, because I don't think that - look - if that apology changes whether they would withdraw it or not, I don't think that it reveals their identity in a way which is relevant to their anonymity if the motion is brought. Yeah, no, okay, maybe it does, but I don't think that it's interfering with another motion to say look I'm willing to withdraw welfare complaint. Like that's not, I don't know. I think that that is a reasonable condition under which I could withdraw a welfare complaint. If someone disagrees then that's fine. I don't think that's intimidation of the person, the welfare complaint was not made to kind of threaten or blackmail this person. The welfare complaint was made because I was told by College to because I was in a state yesterday because I had read this and I was terrified about it going out to the whole JCR.

Angelina: Jacob?

Jacob: Yes?

Treya: Do you want to?

Jacob: Okay. My interpretation of what Elias said to me is that Elias was asking me to convey to the proposer that idea of withdrawal. I could have been interpreting that wrongly, but that is what I got from what was messaged to me.

Sam Newman: This has happened before, 6 months ago...

Elias: Not against me, to clarify...

Sam Newman: No, not against you. Why has no action since then happened and many things were suggested. We already had a no-confidence motion 6 months ago, for the Freshers that don't know, which is again full of, as this original text was, full of inflammatory stuff. And lots of stuff was suggested that we could you know, amend this sort of rule of anonymity so people can't use the JCR as a platform to slander people in front of everyone that goes to the college. Why has no action been taken by exec to alter the rules of anonymous no -cons in that very long period of time?

Jacob: This is a constitutional question. Last year what happened was, for everyone's benefit, there was a motion of no-confidence against the Treasurer, Treya, on various grounds. In this specific situation, there was submitted a motion and a speech. The motion was not particularly attacking. It was quite a factual, well-worded motion. The speech, conversely, was far more aggressive in tone. In light of this, the Constitution was amended, so as to require that the speeches to be solely factual and include no non-factual information. In this case, it was the motion itself that was deemed by some to have been inflammatory rather than the speech. That is why going forwards it has been suggested that these sorts of motions will require the Dean's approval on welfare grounds to happen. This is a future change, rather than a past one.

Elias: Angelina, can I clarify my thoughts on this as well?

Angelina: Yeah.

Elias: I also am reluctant. Like I said, the Decanal idea that is in the MCR constitution was emailed to me by Rachel in response to this, I think it had been mentioned before but I didn't have the actual wording for it, I now have it. This is going to come in some form in week 4 to prevent this kind of thing from happening. The conversation we had about anonymity after the events last term was detailed and essentially the argument was that for people who needed to, especially, for example, for people in welfare capacities people who had specific complaints of why that person might have threatened their welfare or why they might need to be removed couldn't identify themselves for their own welfare reasons for very specific reasons, we need- we should have people able to do that. Now there are disadvantages, as in my opinion you are seeing today, but I think that the anonymity function is something that is quite useful. These are the kind of conversations that we will be having about this. But I think that the Decanal one is a very good idea. We will bring that in week 4, keep your eyes peeled. The reason why it was not before is because we were trying to figure out what to do and we didn't have the text of that provided change, now we do, Rachel sent it to me, and hopefully that will be changed.

Rei proposes a procedural motion to move to vote.

Jacob: There has been a Procedural Motion to move to vote. This is a Procedural Motion to make the vote happen immediately. Vote in favour to have the vote happen immediately with no further; vote against to have further debate in this topic.

Speech in favour (Rei):

I think that we have all said our piece and that we are moving on to the theory of the anonymity in no-cons. I think that we have all said our piece; let's vote before it gets to midnight

Vote:

For: Overwhelming

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Jacob: We now move to vote. This vote must happen by secret ballot. (*Chatter*) Order. Order. Because of the number of people in this room, this cannot happen online, because it would be possible for

someone to see someone else's screen. Therefore, we will have to use a slower, but completely anonymous, procedure. I apologise for this, but it is necessary to ensure anonymity.

Hugo: Do we have to use a secret ballot?

Jacob: Yes.

Elias: Jacob, I have a constitutional question.

Jacob: Point of order - Elias.

Elias: Do I get a vote?

Jacob: No. Not being able to vote is tied to the presidency rather than the Chair. I have over here (*in the corner of the JCR*) a series of paper ballots. Vote on each piece of paper in favour, abstaining, or against. Then, fold your vote, and place them over there. Vote in favour to remove Elias from the office of President. Vote against to keep Elias in the office of President. You may also abstain. It is a vote in favour to do the no-con, and it is a vote against to not do the no-con. Please come up over here, voting one by one.

(*A queue forms from and voting happens*)

Jacob: Point of order - I have the votes.

Vote for the Motion of No-Confidence:

In favour: 11

Against: 44

Abstaining: 3

Spoiled ballots: 0

The Motion fails.

Elias: Thank you, Marion.

Jacob: Yes, thank you. We are very grateful for your help.

7. Charity Motions

8. Monetary Motions

BUY FOOTBALLS

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ The football team of Corpus has no footballs;
- ❖ You need footballs to play football.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ A football team should have footballs;
- ❖ We just got a brand new, big-money library;
- ❖ Surely, we can buy some footballs.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the Treasurer to speak with the Football Captain and to buy footballs within a total budget of £33.

Proposer: Michael Leslie

Seconder: Ed Sanders

Michael and Ed are not here, chair is happy to accept this motion to be proposed by another

BUY FOOTBALLS

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ The football team of Corpus has no footballs;
- ❖ You need footballs to play football.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ A football team should have footballs;
- ❖ We just got a brand new, big-money library;
- ❖ Surely, we can buy some footballs.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the Treasurer to speak with the Football Captain and to buy footballs within a total budget of £33.

Proposer: Tom Fuller

Seconder: Liran Dror

Questions:

Rei: why haven't we waited for the clubs and socs spendings to go out for the football team?

Tom: I think it's a matter of urgency. We need a football for the football we are playing now and the clubs and socs budget wont be complete until at least the end of term.

Angelina: we also do not currently have a clubs and socs officer so we don't know how that funding is going to work yet. Football is happening now.

Elias: if you are not on committee, you should run for clubs and socs officer! Applications are still open, it's a fun role. It's a useful role, you can organise Corpus Challenge, also you get to be on this fun, delightful, committee. Please join. Sorry that wasn't meant to be sarcastic

Freddie Spence: also clubs and socs budgets cover essentially nothing above affiliation fees so you wont be able to get any footballs from that budget

Angelina: also football season has already started so

Elias: a lot of reasons

JJ: do we actually not have a single football right now?

Fionn: we have one

Angelina: no the current one football that we have is actually Michael's personal football that is also horrendously deflated

JJ: so we do actually need to get a new football

Angelina: yeah

Elias: I also would like to clarify that I think it would be great to keep a football in the JCR but maybe that is a separate point.

Name unknown: how many are we buying?

Elias: maximum of £33 so I assume you could get two or three with that

Tom fuller: probably two

Elias: how can you get two footballs with £33? It is an odd number. Oh wait I just forgot that decimal points existed. My bad

Debate:

JJ: do any other societies get money for their balls?

Angelina: you can also ask for it

Elias: most of them will have some already. Usually stuff goes missing but people will ask for it.

Rei: is this constitutionally affiliated with the JCR?

Jacob: Oh come on Rei, yes, it is.

Vote:

For: 22

Against: 1 (Rei doesn't like football)

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

BUY MUGS

The JCR notes that—

❖ There are no mugs.

The JCR believes that—

❖ There should be mugs.

This JCR resolves to—

❖ Mandate the Treasurer to spend up to £35 on mugs.

Proposer: Ben Wharton

Seconder: N/A

Proposer now by Oskari, Treya seconds

BUY MUGS (new)

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ There are no mugs.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ There should be mugs.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the Treasurer to spend up to £35 on mugs.

Proposer: Oskari Pettinen

Seconder: Treya Agarwal

Questions:

Fresher: how do you make sure that they don't go missing again?

Oskari: essentially we can't and mugs are pretty much a running cost for us.

Elias: don't steal the JCR mugs!

Treya: I am actually just going to get really ugly mugs because last time I got really pretty mugs and I saw people stealing them in front of my eyes. So I'm going to get really gross ones

Elias: one comment that I would like to make is that please put your mugs back. The Freshers will not have seen this yet but they will just lie around. We do need to return them to the buttery, the buttery washes and returns them and that is the responsibility of the JCR officers responsible for the tea.

JJ: instead of mugs, can we just get instead the pint glasses we got for Freshers week since they are less likely to be stolen

Oskari: we have had insulated cups but for hot beverages I don't particularly enjoy burning my hands, secondly I think with ceramic at least we know that nothing is leeching into our cups. I don't particularly enjoy drinking from mugs

Fionn: the plastic cups do not fit under the hot chocolate machines either so we should get mugs

JJ: ok I would like to revoke my point

Name Unknown: if we buy the mugs, who would be responsible for taking them back to the buttery?

Treya: whoever is doing JCR Tea

Elias: I don't know if you have seen but every day when Liran emails out the menus, he says an officer's name next to JCR tea then that is their tea. If you are an officer and you miss your tea, death.

Name Unknown: how many mugs will we be able to get?

Treya: I will get the most basic, cheapest, safe to drink mugs and as many of those with the £33. Last time I spent more on the pretty ones and they were treated badly.

Vote:

For: 21

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

PURCHASE PINS FOR BOARDS

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ There is a general lack of pinning materials with which to attach things to the pinboards and ceiling in the JCR;
- ❖ We frequently have to rob or repurpose extant pins from things already pinned, which leaves the pinboards looking rather sparse.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ We should be able to pin up many things and uphold the pride of our diverse community with all of the flags that we have pinned to the ceiling.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the Treasurer to purchase a few packs of drawing pins for no more than £10 for usage by any member of the JCR.

Proposer: Fionn McCommon

Seconder: Azriel Farlam

Questions:

Name unknown: do we or are we planning on having a place to keep the pins when they aren't being used

Fionn: I didn't have a very good idea but Treya just said a very good idea so that (board). Just jam them all into the board and pull one out if there isn't anything it is holding when you need it

Vote:

Favour: 20

Against: 1

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

9. Motions as Submitted

JCR VAC RES MOTION

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ Moving to Oxford in the week can be annoying;
- ❖ Most rooms are already available to students from the previous weekend;
- ❖ Many students don't know that vac res applications to move in on the weekend before term starts are automatically applied;

- ❖ Leaving College the Saturday after term ends can be sad as it does not leave time to pack or enjoy Oxford without work;
- ❖ It is difficult to be out of one's room at 10:00 AM if one is in an onsite room;
- ❖ To change this, the President must bring an agenda item to JCC;
- ❖ An agenda item for JCC must be agreed in the JCR.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ This matter should be brought to JCC.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the President to ask Joint Consultative Committee about extending term contracts by four days, such that people may move into their rooms anytime on Saturday of negative first week and leave on Sunday of ninth week without applying for Vacation Residence.

Proposer: Oskari Penttinen

Seconder: N/A

Questions:

Elias: what this would mean that, for Freshers that haven't seen this yet, you have an email from college over the holiday telling you that you can move in on the Tuesday and if you need to move at any time before that, you need to apply for vac res. The issue is that vac res applications open a really long time in advance. Usually, if you email college and you say that you want to move in to college the weekend before term starts, they pretty much automatically grant you this. This is not an official policy but this is what I have been told and it is important for people to know. This is because if people have parents that cannot help them move up during the week it is useful to know. Therefore, the idea is that instead we will have slightly longer term dates but this would mean that people would automatically, the first day that everyone would move in without applying for vac res would be the Saturday of -1 week, the Saturday right before the equivalent of before Freshers week. And would move out the Sunday of 9th week. This will be extended and vac res applies differently if you have exams. This would mean that everyone would have to pay for 4 more days. This is not something I am necessarily attached to and this is particularly for the finalists who have to move out on the Saturday of 8th week, to try and get us more automatically agreed vac res. College said that they can't do this because they need the rooms for conferencing which is how they finance our education. They said having week 9 is off the table for anyone. This is the compromise. I honestly don't know if I support this motion myself. It is something worth discussing as it is everyone's money.

Oskari withdrew the motion

Jacob: Oskari withdraws. If the proposer withdraws, the chair can decide on a new proposer, or decide to abandon it entirely

Elias: Ok I think that I am happy for another proposer to take it

Rei proposes, Azriel seconds.

JCR VAC RES MOTION (new motion)

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ Moving to Oxford in the week can be annoying;
- ❖ Most rooms are already available to students from the previous weekend;
- ❖ Many students don't know that vac res applications to move in on the weekend before term starts are automatically applied;

- ❖ Leaving College the Saturday after term ends can be sad as it does not leave time to pack or enjoy Oxford without work;
- ❖ It is difficult to be out of one's room at 10:00 AM if one is in an onsite room;
- ❖ To change this, the President must bring an agenda item to JCC;
- ❖ An agenda item for JCC must be agreed in the JCR.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ This matter should be brought to JCC.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the President to ask Joint Consultative Committee about extending term contracts by four days, such that people may move into their rooms anytime on Saturday of negative first week and leave on Sunday of ninth week without applying for Vacation Residence.

Proposer: Rei Ota

Seconder: Azriel Farlam

Big Ben: have we asked college about pricing yet? cause if we say yes or no to this then negotiate pricing.

Elias: this would be 4 extra days on the battels. i don't think then that you can opt out, but I assume that it will be done on normal term rates. But this is in discussion, that is why this motion needs to go through to be discussed in the JCR meeting. If it were to be different, likely whatever is brought up in the JCC I will then bring back to the JCR. It is not necessarily one way or the other. This will include further details like pricing. It is unlikely to be the final say.

Ben Wharton: would it not be better to make it so that those 4 new days are considered standard term time for payment but optional. Like how we have 14 days of academic credit, make those 4 days added on to that. I am someone who always moves in on the Sunday and this is something that would materially benefit me, but I am also aware that this would not benefit others. That way it is still optional for everybody. If we make it standardised rates, no one is being forced in or forced out. I think that is personally the best solution but I get why you want to enforce something college has to listen.

Elias: I think this is something useful but I think that college will just say that that is the vac res scheme. The reason I didn't just settle for this is because of the other side. Often they do deny vac res for those that apply for vac res on the Saturday or Sunday after you have left. The idea is that they would not be able to kick

JJ: when would we have to move out assuming that we haven't done this yet?

Elias: unless you apply for vac res and get it accepted, the Saturday morning of week 8. You finish the term on Friday and then Saturday morning you have to move out.

JJ: it seems a bit aggressive to me

Elias: it is quite steep and people complain about it all the time. The reason why it is there because of conferencing. This is why we are not allowed for 9th week. Conferencing basically funds our degrees.

Big Ben: do I fund my degree?

Elias: no, basically yes you pay student fees but in practice the cost of an Oxford degree is 30k a year and we pay 9k. the loss is compensated through conferencing in part. This would mean that you could move in on the Saturday before 5pm.

JJ: following from that, if you have to move out on the Saturday by 5pm, then you are not staying another night would you still have to pay more?

Elias: yes.

Freddie Spence: I think that also, looking forward, moving in on the Sunday of 0th week next year that will actually be normal. So looking at it this will actually be quite good to get this in place and not getting kicked out on the last day of your degree is quite nice.

Elias: that is why this is here

Jasmine: surely the middle ground is, if the end of term is the part in contention, is to just include that in your argument. 1 extra day that everyone is paying, 61 days

Elias: I think that college will find it more pointless. I think that if people can move in early more people will as well. I think that a lot of them do not know that they can do this. Some people might not want it.

Name unknown: why not send an email to college and say like if someone doesn't want this they can just opt out

Elias: I can try

Treya: that is how vac res works

Elias: yeah but vac res is opt in not opt out. I can try make these days opt out rather than opt in. I can propose this to them if they would prefer that. I am not sure how happy they are with it.

Debate:

Vote:

For: 18

Against: 4

Abstain: 1

Motion passes

COMPULSORY VAC STORAGE

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ It is very useful when rooms have storage that can be locked in the vac (e.g. Oldham's under-bed storage);
- ❖ Everyone has stuff that they would rather leave at Uni in the vac and is annoying to take home (e.g. bedding, cooking equipment).

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ Everyone should have access to at least some vac storage in their rooms;
- ❖ There is no reason why every room can't have, at least, one bit of furniture that can be park locked or locked in the vac by the student that is living there.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the President to speak to College about ensuring that every student has some vac storage.

Proposer: Thomas Fuller

Seconder: N/A

Oskari seconds

COMPULSORY VAC STORAGE (new)

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ It is very useful when rooms have storage that can be locked in the vac (e.g. Oldham's under-bed storage);
- ❖ Everyone has stuff that they would rather leave at Uni in the vac and is annoying to take home (e.g. bedding, cooking equipment).

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ Everyone should have access to at least some vac storage in their rooms;
- ❖ There is no reason why every room can't have, at least, one bit of furniture that can be park locked or locked in the vac by the student that is living there.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the President to speak to College about ensuring that every student has some vac storage.

Proposer: Thomas Fuller

Seconder: Oskari Pettinen

Questions:

Debate:

Vote:

Favour: 24

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

THE ACQUISITION OF MONEY

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ Money is a medium of exchange that can be traded for goods and services;
- ❖ The JCR requires a regular supply of goods and services;
- ❖ Money is the ideal means through which to acquire these goods and services.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ Officers provide vital services to the access, arts, clubs and societies, domestic affairs, entertainment, environment and charity, international affairs, and welfare of the JCR;

- ❖ Representatives provide vital services to the representation of the JCR;
- ❖ Both Officers and Representatives need money, in order to acquire goods and services, for their vital services to the JCR;
- ❖ The JCR should therefore provide money to Officers and Representatives in budgetary form.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Pass the budget that is contained in the annex to this motion.

Proposer: Treya Agarwal

Seconder: Sam Newman

Sam is absent, Vrinda seconds:

THE ACQUISITION OF MONEY

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ Money is a medium of exchange that can be traded for goods and services;
- ❖ The JCR requires a regular supply of goods and services;
- ❖ Money is the ideal means through which to acquire these goods and services.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ Officers provide vital services to the access, arts, clubs and societies, domestic affairs, entertainment, environment and charity, international affairs, and welfare of the JCR;
- ❖ Representatives provide vital services to the representation of the JCR;
- ❖ Both Officers and Representatives need money, in order to acquire goods and services, for their vital services to the JCR;
- ❖ The JCR should therefore provide money to Officers and Representatives in budgetary form.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Pass the budget that is contained in the annex to this motion.

Proposer: Treya Agarwal

Seconder: Vrinda Vig

Questions:

Rei: it is an increase of about 30% since last Michaelmas term I just wanted you to explain the rationale for this

Treya: that is so fair. One of the main reasons is that we now have a much bigger entz team and there was motivation to give them more. We also have Freshers week losses that I had to include. We also had to include a better plan of events from internationals, from arts, welfare, all of which have increased based on their detailed week by week plans of this. If you think that it is fiscally irresponsible I am happy to show you why it is in my opinion. I think it is fine, unless we spend 2 grand on sofas. I think it is a good idea when we have more Freshers excited about attending more events

Elias: I would also like to add that we have had steady increases since last year. I think that is it also because of the new system that Treya has introduced which I think is working really well. It is about officers asking for money at the start of term rather than giving them arbitrary numbers as it was before

Treya: before it was the same amount every term for each officer which in my opinion I didn't really understand why we were doing that so I have asked officers to ask me for money and I think that it is going good.

Elias: also inflation

JJ: sorry just to clarify, is this a motion to increase the budget or to redistribute money

Treya: neither. It is to let us spend money. We cant spend money unless we pass the budget

JJ: oh sorry I was confused

Elias: basically, for the Freshers who don't know, we are not allowed to control the money because either we can embezzle or we can just on stuff without asking. This means that the JCR controls all the money, we aren't allowed to make the monetary stuff without the JCR approval. The budget allows officers to spend this money without having to submit a motion every time.

Fionn: what is the £50 set aside for Treya's surprise?

Treya: Oh yeah so I do this every term where I will pick a day to bring ice cream or cakes to the JCR and I will pull up with really nice cakes from Paul or ice cream from G&Ds. I think previously it was done only during Trinity Term but I would like to continue that

Name Unknown: where does this money come from?

Treya: so basically we have two sources of funding for the JCR, there are two strains of revenue. Theres the levies that are on your battels, you would've seen them, you can opt out on these but then you cant participate in JCR activities. Then there is the grant from college, where college gives us about £3.2 k a term as a grant. That goes into the JCR bank account and we apportion that via motions and the budget

Elias: there are also lots of other rules that we have to follow to make sure that people in the future can also do this.

Name Unknown: so the budget that you have sent us, this is the expenditure that you expect to do over this term? Is there not a way to account for the inflow of money?

Treya: yeah there is in the spending report which I will be publishing at the end of my tenure

JJ: how often are these meetings?

Jacob: every two weeks, on Sundays at 7.30pm.

Debate:

Vote:

Favour: 19

Against: 1

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

10. Emergency Motions

BUYING SOFAS

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ The JCR sofas are extremely dirty and disgusting;
- ❖ Multiple people in the past have admitted to having sex on them, vomiting on them, pissing on them, and spreading other ungodly fluids on that furniture;
- ❖ We have had these sofas for too long and they are clearly suffering from wear and tear and terrible hygiene.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ We should have a clean space and environment in the JCR that isn't a toxic danger to the environment.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the Treasurer to put aside a budget of up to £1000 that is specifically to buy a new sofa and new sofa chairs for the JCR, and to throw away the old sofa and sofa chairs.

Proposer: Arian Amiri

Seconder: Weronika Szpak

JJ proposes, Cathy Seconds

BUYING SOFAS (new)

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ The JCR sofas are extremely dirty and disgusting;
- ❖ Multiple people in the past have admitted to having sex on them, vomiting on them, pissing on them, and spreading other ungodly fluids on that furniture;
- ❖ We have had these sofas for too long and they are clearly suffering from wear and tear and terrible hygiene.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ We should have a clean space and environment in the JCR that isn't a toxic danger to the environment.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the Treasurer to put aside a budget of up to £1000 that is specifically to buy a new sofa and new sofa chairs for the JCR, and to throw away the old sofa and sofa chairs.

Proposer: JJ Fitzpatrick

Seconder: Cathy Scoon

Questions:

Fionn: why have you done this?

JJ: because not gonna lie these sofas look like they are unwashed, and I will be honest, I thought that I was being violated when I read a list of everything that has happened on that. I would like to believe that I could sit on a sofa more comfortable without knowing what has happened on it

Elias: denial is a great solution. I cant recommend it enough

Treya: also we don't know for a fact whether this has happened or not.

Rei: can we afford this?

JJ: according to the budget we can

Treya: what? No that is not in the budget.

Arian: the only reason why I put £1000 is so that the treasurer can go away and do her own research.

Treya: can I speak on a financial point? That is really fair but I think that there is a point of contention over here. We do not actually own these sofas or the room and anything in it. the only thing that the JCR owns is the money that we have. These are technically college's property I would much rather go to college and list these things and ask them to change it.

JJ: can we just get another really nice cleaning crew?

Treya: oh that is another thing, it gets cleaned every 3 days by the Scouts. They vacuum it and everything. It is not like the JCR does not get cleaned ok. However, there are some stains on the sofas

Fionn: I want it to be known that there is a large brown stain on that seat it is not shit it is hot chocolate and I know that because I spilled it

Treya: even if they have been cleaned I think that it is worth talking to college about refurbishing this.

Arian proposes amendment so that the executive committee talks to college first and tries to ask them about getting new sofas in the JCR. (amendment taken as friendly)

BUYING SOFAS (final)

The JCR notes that—

- ❖ The JCR sofas are extremely dirty and disgusting;
- ❖ Multiple people in the past have admitted to having sex on them, vomiting on them, pissing on them, and spreading other ungodly fluids on that furniture;
- ❖ We have had these sofas for too long and they are clearly suffering from wear and tear and terrible hygiene.

The JCR believes that—

- ❖ We should have a clean space and environment in the JCR that isn't a toxic danger to the environment.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the Executive committee to speak to college about replacing/improving JCR furniture

Proposer: JJ Fitzpatrick

Seconder: Cathy Scoon

Vote:

For: 23

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Motion passes

11. Any Other Business

Jacob: We are not done yet! I have a business to raise in any other business. I am very boring, I know. This Thursday, at 3 to 4 PM, there is a Green Impact meeting in College on environment and sustainability. If you are interested in these issues, please come. I will send an email about this. Meeting adjourned at 10:27 PM.