**Wadham SU meeting – Sunday 5th week MT17**

**Apologies received: Academic,**

**Officers absent: Amenities, housing, international, sports, staff liaison, suspended students, tortoise, trans**

**Officers’ reports**

* President: Attended welfare committee, me and Ivy have held meeting with College about SU funding. More to follow in discussion points
* Vice President: successful election this week, congrats to new Suspended Students Officer. Welfare elections postponed, we need more candidates! Please run. Oxford SU are introducing new election software that I will be seeking to implement soon. We are working on SU website content.
* Treasurer: We’ve had a loan from college for Queerfest
* Academic and Careers:
* Access: Had a meeting with Oxford SU about training sessions
* Amenities:
* Arts: talked to SU about putting a mural up in college. How do people fel about there being arts posters around college? Plugged Random, funded by Wadham. Play has been successful and raised funds for charity
* Bar and Social: Have run University Challenge trials. Main issue is women’s only place, to be discussed later
* Charities, Environment, and Ethics: Ran promise auction, turnout was not great but we raised £120 for charity. College will be getting fairtrade status back
* Class: ran first class social, will run another in 6th or 7th week around queerfest
* Communications: nothing to report
* Disabilities: introduces discussion point on SU emails
* Domestic: nothing to report
* Entz: Ran a good bop, Queerfest is looking good too
* Food:
* Housing:
* International Students:
* LGBTQ+: Sorry we’ve been behind on emails, working on queer week and will publish timetable by Tuesday
* PoCRE: BME breakfast next Sunday
* Sarah Lawrence (Exchange Program): planning to run two big events for Wadham and SL students, including a 90s themed one and a staff appreciation tea
* Sports Officer:
* Staff Liaison:
* Suspended Students:
* Tech: one of the speakers for loan is out of action
* Trans:
* Welfare: Welfare week has begun, thanks for coming to welfare brunch, which we’re hoping to run every term in 5th week. Please get people to run for welfare! We need at least one self identifying male to run. Please run and free me! The nurse wants us to relay that people need MMR boosters if they haven’t had them already. Wadham is to start reimbursing over the counter medicines
* Break for pizza.
* Back to seats
* Women: As part of welfare week, I’m running women’s pizza night, hope women were able attend the University Challenge trials today. Working to set up rowing club.
* See discussion point on women in University challenge below

**Motions**

* **Motion to clean up the SU constitution**
* Proposed by Jack Wands, seconded by Lizzy Diggins
* Jack: after scanning through the SU constitution we’ve found small flaws and inconsistencies, such as a lack of mechanism for a tie in college referenda. We want to re-run referenda in that way, and we want longer manifestos for VP and Treasurers. Also recognise the transfer of responsibilities from welfare to equalities officers. We think only the referendum change would be controversial, but when this goes to second meeting we can vote on the motion in parts.
* Ivy: does the constitution have any provision for ties at the moment?
* Jack: Yes in motions, but not for referenda.
* Q. Should we remove the Tortoise’s casting vote? This seems ridiculous
* A. The tortoise is just a way of ensuring change
* Q. My issue is with the fact that a motion passes if it’s a tie. The SU hasn’t voted for it.
* A. Apparently the tortoise is a radical. And if the tortoise isn’t real at the time, the chair has a vote. I think we should leave it to the chair in any time.
* Alex: propose friendly amendment that the Chair of the meeting always gets a vote in the event of the tie, no enfranchised tortoises please
* End of first reading
* **Motion to change the number of officers and reps**
* Proposed by Lizzy Diggins, seconded by Jack Wands
* Lizzy: me and Jack think that the size of the SU committee means different officers attend different meetings, so college doesn’t see same people
* Jack: this motion changes the second welfare and entz officers into reps, ensuring that there is only one officer for each job who is expected to show up to college committees and SU subcommittees
* Son: the motion says the Entz officer would have to attend ALL meetings. But we often have only small contributions to make to SU meetings. This is a huge workload for single person
* Lizzy: this isn’t about SU meetings but SU cttee and college meetings, reducing the number of officers makes it easier to make quorum which is very difficult right now
* Joseff: would it be possible to run for rep but not officer?
* A. Yes
* Alex: slight problem with the last point in ‘resolves’ section of motion, change Entz to Entz Officer
* Alex: Entz is not a very hierarchy-friendly role
* A. This is all about making sure somebody is in charge of feedback
* **Motion to create an SU executive committee**
* Proposed by Lizzy Diggins, seconded by Jack Wands
* Lizzy: while we think it’s great Wadham has a huge committee, each of which does a big job. But we do need to streamline running of the SU day-to-day. We want to mandate existing subcommittees to meet and make use of these more through twice termly meetings (though feel free to tweak these). We currently have SU committee meetings every two weeks, but we’d create an SU Executive consisting of those who really needed to go to meetings that regularly. This comes from Jack’s discussion with the Oxford SU President about running a large SU.
* Jack: Currently the fortnightly meetings are unwieldy, and not so many people have to come and talk as we have atm
* This is sort of a trial and we can revert is
* Q. Isn’t every officer or rep on a subcommittee?
* A. Not exactly, it’s all in the constitution but most officers are on one.
* Lizzy: this makes whole SU committee meetings, which would be less frequent, more of a meaningful event
* Alex: what decisions would the SU executive make?
* Jack: this would be about co-ordinating day to day stuff, college meetings, and bringing stuff to the SU. This doesn’t detract from the SU members’ powers
* End of first reading
* **Motion to create a deposit system for tech equipment**
* Proposed by Morag Campbell, seconded by Emily Hampson
* At the moment anyone can borrow stuff from the tech cupboard and unfortunately stuff goes missing and we can’t keep track of it
* We would be creating an inventory and tracking who borrows it
* The deposit would be either £5 or a personal item, which would be returned on the item being given back
* Point: atm the key to the tech cupboard is available in the lodge. Anyone can get it. How would you enforce the system?
* A. We would be relying on trust.
* These are big pieces of equipment and less mobile than airbeds. If something was taken without being checked out we would be treating it as a theft. Does that seem harsh?
* Q. What constitutes a valuable item? That would vary depending on the person. Would it be possible to have a library system where you have to exchange a tag or similar for the item?
* A. An item of personal value could be something like a bod card or ID that would inconvenient to not have. It would be a reminder to return our stuff
* Alex: although stuff does go missing we have to have a system based on trust
* Jack: I would be surprised if we could persuade the lodge to take responsibility for recording loans
* Son: are any of these goods insured? What happens if it’s damaged?
* We will look into insurance but paperwork is a mess. We would be reasonable about accidental damage
* Q. How often to people borrow things?
* A. A lot, we have decks, speakers, lights etc but we should advertise it more
* Lizzy: could we have a graded system roughly in proportion to the value of the item? Borrowing decks for a house party hosted by multiple people would not be protected much by a £5 loss
* A. A good idea but it might be complicated to run
* Q. What about issuing cheques that would be cashed if goods are not returned
* Most people don’t have cheque books but we could take that system if someone wants to give us a cheque
* Q. Why can’t the tech officers just keep control of the keys?
* A. I don’t know why the Lodge is selective about which keys it will give out. And getting the goods back is still a problem even if we control loans
* Lizzy: the Lodge really won’t agree to take on any more responsibilities, but we could limit control of the keys to Tech and Entz AND have a deposit system.
* Friendly amendment that access of keys to cupboard is limited to tech and entz officers
* Ivy: we shouldn’t vote until spoken to lodge
* **Motion tabled until next SU meeting**
* **Motion to fund *Lighthouse***
* Proposed by Margo Munro Kerr, seconded by Samuel Dunnet
* Margo edits the journal on international relations, to which I think Wadham subscribed. We’re asking for £100. This would ensure students have a chance to write
* Q. What avenues of funding are you pursuing?
* Just JCRs but I don’t know which
* Q. We’re not actually subscribed to the journal. Can we get copies of the magazine in exchange
* Alex: given Margo is not here and we can’t get answers to factual questionsl, let’s table the motion.
* **Motion tabled until next SU meeting**

**Discussion points**

* **Women in Wadham’s University Challenge team**
* Greg: in our trials so far we have had a high number of male entrants and the top scoring ones have all been male. Should we make sure there’s a woman on the team even if she scores lower than the other trial entrants?
* Jack: when we were invited to enter a team we were encouraged to represent the institution as a whole
* Vita: we’d like to have a representative team however it would be embarrassing and maybe tokenistic (we fear) that the team was not selected on a meritocratic basis if this affects performance. But we’re very keen to submit a balanced team
* Son: we should run a team on a meritocratic basis or submit no team. It would not be good for the welfare of the woman entrant to be there knowing she was let in to fill a quota. This is national television
* Vita: would the SU be comfortable with submitting an all male team or prefer no team?
* Room is very quiet
* Alex: even if the team didn’t perform that well, it would be important to have a woman in order to encourage future female applicants
* Helena: if the team loses this puts a lot of unfair pressure on the woman
* Point: it’s possible if there was a woman on the team which didn’t do that well, it would still raise awareness in college
* Vita: we selected the team based on applicants to trials after we publicised them heavily by email. ITV provided the materials and we calculated the scores
* Dan: it would be better to field a team than not to enter anyone.
* Ivy: Perhaps a balanced approach where a woman who makes it into the top six gets on the team
* Vita: are you happy to leave this to our discretion?
* Room agrees
* Q. When do you have to submit entrants?
* A. Two weeks’ time
* Vote: would you be comfortable to put forward an all male team?
* Majority vote in favour
* **Band room**
* Jack: the Goddard room is a bit of a mess and we’re thinking of running a bike-shed style cull. Any instruments left over we might sell, use or give to charity. The room will be demolished in a year so we need to clear it. Is everyone happy with that?
* Point: a lot of stuff was used last year and it would be important to check ownership
* Jack: I will be sending an email around soon. Do we need to do a motion?
* Alex: this is a big thing, this should be a motion discussed at a later meeting
* **Capitation**
* Ivy: we get about £33,000 from college per year as the SU. That’s £71.50 per student, but we get half the funding per 4th year. But this has been frozen for about 10 years, so in real terms we’re getting much less. The only figure we have for before 2008 is 2001, in which we got funding, in today’s terms of £95 per student. So we’d be getting £45k per year, £12k more. We think college should uprate our funding dramatically, however college doesn’t share this view
* We currently have a deficit of £7k a year, which we wouldn’t have if our funding had risen with inflation
* The SU is doing more than it was in 2001 and we have more students, which college funding has only partly mitigated
* We suggested to Peter, the finance bursar, that SU funding should be linked to rent for college rooms, which is pegged to the Retail Prices Index of inflation. Peter disagrees on the grounds that college subsidises rent. College wants to pass on the full inflation in housing costs to students, thus he argues inflation in rent is higher than that of college costs
* Peter is nice but he did tell us two weeks ago that the grant to SU funding was linked to tuition fees. That was an outright lie.
* Peter wants to fund the SU as if it were another college department and thus not automatically get inflationary budget increases. I see some reasons for this, and we do need to bear in mind the funding available for future students
* We went into a meeting wanting to agree a permanent capitation (college grant to the SU) policy, but Peter says he likes flexibility to respond to different roles
* Jack: the reason we disagree is that this flexibility has reduced SU funding value by about £12k a year over the past 8 years
* Ivy: Peter wants us to come back to him with a list of efficiencies we’re making and what we’ll specifically do with any extra funding. We want a strong mandate to be able to say college students are not happy with the current situation
* Alex: did you pick him up on the lie about the tuition fees link?
* A. Well we don’t want to be too critical of college, we have pointed out it isn’t true and Peter has only been in post for one year so he might have been mistaken
* Q. If we get the extra funding does this detract from anything else?
* A. College gets funding from half our tuition fees, conferences, endowments (both restricted and unrestricted). The college can’t take more than 3.5% of the endowment per year but Peter wants to run a surplus to grow future income. This is what would probably be hit if we got extra funding
* Q. Could we push for a minimum increase and negotiate on a flexible income rise elsewhere.
* Ivy: what would people like us to spend a budget increase on?
* Georgia: we are currently very very stingy on sports funding relative to other colleges
* Ivy: As of last year we’ve started reimbursing some sporting costs, we want to keep this. College will be overhauling its funding for sports. The tiny funds that exist are inadequate and half of the Amalgamated Clubs budget goes to the Boat Club, which college will be correcting in its overhaul. Would anybody object to us fighting to improve sports funding?
* Nobody objects
* Jack: If anyone has any ideas of what the SU could be spending money on if it had more money and would presently cost too much, do let us know. There are useful things we could be doing.
* Ivy: though I’ve called for reform of money meetings I’d like to not cut them, and our decision to reimburse non-prescription medicine will increase spending
* Georgia: could you get each officer to submit spending ideas?
* Jack: I do think college will give us more money, but the only debate is about how much.
* Ivy: I’d like to convert this into a motion to give us a strong mandate to negotiate with college.
* Motion to follow later
* **Colour in SU emails**
* Issue raised that colorblind people have been struggling to read emails where SU officers have failed to attach greyscale versions
* Apparently colours make people more likely to read emails
* Patrick has suggested that the main email should be black and white and a colour attachment provided
* Helena: could we use highlights instead of colours? This benefits readability without removing colour
* Carys: don’t think people will be bothered to open a colour attachment
* Jack: I think welfare is a special case, it’s the only email long enough you really need colours to navigate
* Q. Why can’t we simply mandate SU officers to attach a black and white copy of emails?
* A. The problem is officers do forget, and some people complain when corrections are sent out as this compounds the problem
* Lizzy: I only like to use colours in long emails to boost readbaility
* Carys: somebody suggested a strike system where forgetting a certain number of times results in a ban for an officer using colours in emails
* Point: people will read or not read emails regardless of colour
* This point is contested
* Carys clarifies that the Disabilities officers are not arguing firmly one way or another
* Ivy: often SU emails are dry but they are important. We do need more engagement in the SU and colour emails do have some benefit in engaging some people
* Point: we are at Oxford, we read try books and emails all the time, do emails really have to be that bright and colourful?
* Lizzy: a point from a viewer of live minutes: a student says I’m not colourblind but I do find colours without strong contrast against white very difficult to read
* Straw poll: who is in favour of getting rid of colourful SU emails, and finding different ways to get people to read them?
* Inconlusive vote
* **Emergency motions**
* Emergency motion on funding transport to Yarl’s Wood protest
* This is an emergency motion as the protest outside the detention centre takes place before the next SU meeting
* There is a termly protest of many activist groups, hitherto lead by the now scandal hit Movement for Justice but they are now being shunned and Oxford organisations are stepping up to run subsidised coaches to the protest
* We want to ensure refugees can low income groups can come to the protest
* A coach costs £600, we want £150 from Wadham SU
* Jack: this came to Oxford SU, which gave £300 to this cause. I’ve been to a talk from a charity supporting LGBT refugees who’ve been in the centre. They said at present the protests are aggrevating the guards and home office, with adverse effects on the detainees. They say we should focus on legal aid funding instead. That’s why I abstained at the Oxford SU meeting
* I don’t want to veto this motion but in future we should look at different solutions
* A. I also have my doubts, including on our focus on Yarl’s Wood, but this motion doesn’t make or break the protest, it determines whether people on low incomes can go if they do want.
* Alex: I brought this up at the last meeting and I’m concerned about Movement for Justice.
* A. They have been completely cut out of the protest altogether.
* **Motion passes**
* **Emergency motion on funding negotiations with college**
* Proposed by Ivy Manning
* The SU has had a £12k real terms reduction in funding in recent years, the SU is running a deficit, there is no longer college subsidy for gym membership etc.
* The SU thinks the money that was allocated to Iffley subsidies should go now to the SU
* **Motion passes**

**Oxford SU**

* Meeting disbands as quorum is lost
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