

# St John's College Junior Common Room

## The People's Republic of St Giles

Minutes for the 4th meeting of Trinity Term 2015  
7<sup>th</sup> of June 2015, 8.30pm, JCR

Christina started by flagging up the business discussed in the previous meeting concerning the BME event that had bacon in it, saying that she had spoken to the BME rep and discovered it was not at all as bad as had been previously thought, and that she was confident this was a non-issue.

Christina also welcomed our new Officers and congratulated them on their recent electoral victory - Jess, Academic Affairs, Katy, Women's, and Rhiannon, Welfare.

### i/ Minutes of the previous meeting

### ii/ Matters arising from the minutes

### iii/ Officers' reports

Christina confirmed that Pete did complete the academic feedback report, and that it was of good standard.

Ssuuna said as there are no more entz happening this term (with the usual entz ban), there was nothing to report.

Claudia said she had been liaising with the MCR on upcoming events.

Vicky told us that she had been reimbursing people as usual.

Blathnaid informed us that Freshers week was "sorted" - we like the optimism!

Christina said she'd been talking to the BME rep, got compulsory sexual consent workshops put through equality committee for the freshers week timetable. New harassment policy had also been put through, with stalking included as well as much more. Further, following the majority support for gendered hours in the gym and beginners hours college had supported the former, but not discussed the latter yet.

### iv/ Reps' reports

### v/ Ratifications

Alumni & Development Rep: **VACANT**

Art Reps: Re-ratified Lauren and Fania

Bike Rep: Daniil ratified

Charity Reps: Meredith steps down, Zoe ratified, Cecilia re-ratified

Computer Rep: **VACANT** (despite an incentive from the President "You don't have to come to any of this crap")

Disability Rep: Tom re-ratified

DVD Rep: Charlie re-ratified (after making clear “I would to continue *alooooooooone!*”)

BME Rep: Rochelle ratified, Cameron re-ratified

International Rep: Syrie re-ratified

LGBTQ Rep: Jacob ratified, Jamie re-ratified

OUSU Rep: Michael ratified

Alex asked “can we ask questions to the candidates?”, to which Christina responded in the affirmative. Alex: “I didn’t have any, sorry!”

PRAT: Alastair ratified

Returning Officer: Will re-ratified

## vi/ Items for discussion

### vii/ Agenda Items

#### a/ Disabilities Rep to Officer Motion

Proposer: Thomas Wadsworth      Seconder: Katy Haigh

Tom outlined the motion.

The motion was amended to allow a rep-officer changeover to take place constitutionally.

Jacob asked how Michaelmas elections would work - would the entire JCR be able to vote? Tom answered that anyone could vote, but that there’d be a conscience clause.

Ali asked if the large number of mandates conflicted at all with the autonomy of officers. Tom said that some of it had been left broad, some important things had been set out more specifically.

David asked if currently the Rep has to be a disabled person - Christina said no.

Jamie asked if the same logic extends to LGBTQ and BME Reps - Tom said they can bring their own motions.

Flora spoke in support of the motion, and asked that LGBTQ and BME reps also come with similar motions.

Ali had concerns about the buddy scheme, as it would involve the collation of medical data on students. He worried that this data couldn’t be protected.

Jacob said that data protection is important, but that if people ask to be put on this buddy scheme they should be allowed to do that, with the associated privacy invasion that entails. Katy said that she was offered a buddy scheme on a basis of you will get one if you ask for one, it’s not enforced on anybody. Ameen said DAS offer a mentor system also, often trained for specific disabilities.

Jamie said that the reason we have a good LGBTQ community is because the reps have been good. He worried that the larger portfolio of an officer might put off people from running for Disabilities Officer - we won’t have Tom forever. Tom replied that the Officership does actually make people run for things, and that actually nobody ran for it as a rep role except him. Katy said officer positions are good in giving support and structure.

David argued that the current structure of having an Equality & Diversity Officer and a body of reps works well, and that this is not the answer. Kate said they're either all reps or officers.

Caitlin asked what would happen to the E&D role if this motion passed. Toby said the LGBTQ role is very socially focussed, the problem for the disabilities role is that it's low-profile position. There's more ableism than homophobia and disabled people are less likely to reach out to the JCR.

Flora said that LGBTQ do a lot more than just social events. She also said that she regretted splitting the Access role up (it used to be Access & Equal Opportunities), and that instead liberation reps should've been made officers. She took pains to note this was in no way a criticism of Claudia.

Motion was voted on in parts - one the promotion from rep to officer, the other to mandate them to do various things (outlined in the motion).

Motion to vote by secret ballot passed.

Both halves of the motion **PASSED** - 32/17/6 and 32/17/7 respectively (for/against/abstain)

#### **b/ Prescription Costs Motion**

Proposer: Thomas Wadsworth

Seconder: Jess Colston

The motion was amended to change from a levy to JCR funding.

Tom outlined the motion.

It was noted that our only idea for demand came from a survey done in Wadham, and Tom was asked if there was any other indication. He said he used the Wadham survey alone, but reduced it by a bit.

Beth asked if anyone would be able to claim - answer yes. She also asked how you could claim - something like the condom scheme? Tom said he would set up a committee to work that out.

Daniil asked if the amount turned out to be very inexact, then what then? Tom said Michaelmas term results would show the demand well.

Toby asked where the figure £820 came from, and if there was any leeway. Vicky said that we get a set amount from the college budget, if everyone spent their max we'd overspend, but we usually underspend.

Meredith flagged that there is an NHS form you can fill out to get prescriptions free anyway. Kate said it was a hard form.

Christina said we should publicise this form. Jake argued that it would be worth trying to promote this form before spending such a lot of money. Tom said we would promote it anyway, but that the form takes time to fill in.

Ali wanted to know how this data could be anonymised, saying the JCR should not be logging medical data. Tom said he didn't know how, but that the committee would work that out.

John asked how much people would be able to claim - Tom said everything. Kate asked if this included dental costs, and Tom said it wouldn't.

Christina read out a point from Lewis, saying that the HC3 certificate is still available and quick and easy to apply for. Tom Hill said that while he had no experience of this form, surely its existence and the combined intellect of the JCR meant it is possible to reclaim all costs from the NHS and therefore adding the JCR is an unnecessary complication. Katy said she'd failed the form twice.

Goodman noted that adding the JCR would slow down the whole process, and cost us a lot of money. Vicky said that the money is there if we need it, but that's aside from the point that people can use the form to get it for free.

Ali said that we have a nurse in college who can help us with forms, and liaise with the doctors' practice. The money may well be there in the JCR account but it's an awful lot of it, and given people can get this for free it's not the best use of JCR money. Such a stop-gap measure is bad, especially if there is a view for the scheme to be ramped up further after trial.

David said that the only argument for setting up a prescriptions committee is to help filling the form - what's to stop people claiming off the JCR and the NHS?

Cecilia asked if a form exists for international students, and also noted that the form is super easy. Anna replied that international students can't get the form.

Jake noted that if people can't fill out the form immediately, you can still backdate it by up to three months, and given no student is going to have a greater income than £16,000 everyone can use it. This scheme is just spending JCR money.

Toby said that given the cost is based on Wadham, where they use a big levy, then why should we trial something different here when it won't work economically.

The motion was further amended so that beneficiaries of the scheme would pay the JCR the money back once they receive the money from the NHS.

Jamie was confused about the amendment, saying that we've added so many extra steps to the process, and that it is very pessimistic to assume the JCR will fail to help you fill out the form in the whole three month period you can backdate. Goodman said the disincentive to fill out the form, because the JCR will just pay for you, will stop people bothering to fill it out then pay the JCR back. Why do extra work?

The motion was **TIED** 22 votes for and against - the President cast the deciding vote in favour, therefore **PASSING** the motion.

#### c/ Begging Motion

Proposer: Charlie Clegg

Seconder: Beth Candlin

**Motion clearly PASSES nem con**

#### d/ The "Sports Rep" Motion

Proposer: Jennifer Smith

Seconded: Zoe Carmichael

Jenny outlined the motion. Anna asked if the Sports Rep would run gym beginners sessions - Jenny said yes. Jacob asked what the budget would be - Jenny said the amalgamated sports club holds the whole budget, the rep would have another.

Finch said that the amalgamated sports club organises all the sports, and that as only the treasurer exists we should resurrect it. The sports rep would be good for putting results on emails etc. but the ASC should be revived.

**Motion clearly PASSES**

**e/ Thank You and Farewell :(**

Proposer: Danny Waldman

Seconded: Turlough O'Hagan

**Motion clearly PASSES nem con**, to which your Secretary cooed "Good JCR..."

**f/ Union Cocktail Motion**

Proposer: Ameen Chekroud

Seconder: Rochelle Morrison

A motion that this motion not be put was raised. Jake said that the motion is out of date - the Union has apologized, and that this motion doesn't acknowledge that. Ameen said the timing wasn't an issue, and that the Union needed to be fought on this.

Motion that the motion not be put falls.

Ameen outlined the motion.

Zoe asked what OSSL was - Ameen said OUSU's mailing list, things like RAG get a space.

Christina read out Olivia's statement. Jamie said that while the Union had acted badly, the mailing list ban wouldn't be a good thing. Things like debating need that mailing list - the Union does bad things but this would condemn it forever. Trying to stop freshers joining the Union doesn't help.

David said if the main issue is denouncing racism, why also remove advertising?

Motion to vote on this motion in parts PASSED.

Ssuuna said that one person, non-student, made the poster in question, without the knowledge of any students. No committee produced it. Ssuuna said he organized the debate, and had no idea a poster had been made.

Unfriendly amendment to change from condemning the Union to condemning its past actions PASSED.

Ssuuna clarified the speaking rights issue, saying only elected people could speak at the meetings as opposed to appointed people (hence BME rep not having speaking rights).

Jamie said the motion should condemn previous treatment, not the current situation which is improving.

Alex asked if he could close the window as it was cold.

Amendment to condemn past actions and acknowledge the steps made in response **PASSED**.

Cecilia said that if we don't stand against this, then we're effectively for it.

Tim said that it is not as binary as for or against - we can see this as a mistake that people are acknowledged; the racist label is potentially too strong. David agreed we're not pro or anti it at all, it's not our role to pronounce on everything that happens in Oxford. Disagree with the binary nature. Rochelle said this isn't an issue we can be neutral on.

Tom said it doesn't matter that it was seen by one committee - we're condemning the general racism of the Union.

Ssuuna said that stating that the Union has acknowledged this instance of racism means it is a racist institution is a non-sequitur. From his experience, the Union is not at all institutionally racist. When the racism motion passed, his opinion was overlooked. Passing this would be bad for access.

Rochelle said it is not our responsibility to think about access.

Finch noted the "oodles" of white privilege in the room, but also noted that the BME opinion in the room is divided between for and against, with the against being better informed on the incident.

Ssuuna appreciated that sincere views were being expressed, but noted with admirable restraint that when people ignore the actual facts he is presenting that it is very annoying.

Part of the motion condemning past behaviour of the Union **PASSED**

Part of the motion mandating the Committee to write to OUSU President asking that the Union not be able to access mailing lists **FALLS**

#### viii/ Any other business

Flora said there was a chapel service next week, and wanted everyone to come. Daniil wanted to know who had damaged the pool cues, and Vicky said she would replace them next term but noted it was becoming a pisstake.

Meeting closed 23:05

Danny Waldman  
JCR Secretary  
10/6/2015