**Wadham SU meeting – Sunday 7th week MT17**

**Apologies received: Amenities and access**

**Officers absent:, domestic, staff liaison, tortoise**

**Officers’ reports**

* President: Most of my work has been on housing next year. We will have 24-32 non Freshers who would normally live in college having to live out. We will be offering the five houses to live out before the room ballot, and people will apply in groups of five. Had Equalities cttee on Wednesday, we will be looking at appointing new Tutors for Equalities. Resisted college smoking ban. Me and Treasurer are still negotiating with College on capitation, have got concession rent has gone up with college costs
* Vice President: Ran last set of elections this term, for our new CEE officer. Milo is doing handover for this. Am collecting mid term reports. I want to work out which is the most helpful format for these, would like feedback. Will be getting an Oxford SU website.
* Treasurer: finished freshers book grant processing, payments in the works
* Academic and Careers: I have just been elected, will be having handover with capacity. Could anyone free help with QF clear up right now please?
* Access:
* Amenities:
* Arts: have sewing machine now, please contact by email if interested
* Bar and Social: Bar was stressful, less profitable than normal due to stealing and spillage. Will need larger bar space in future queer fest
* Charities, Environment, and Ethics: pending handover, noth
* Class: social on Tuesday next week
* Communications: bulletins to restart this week, have been helping with press last week
* **Room agreed to only mention names in minutes in future where the officer is speaking or mentioning other officers, to prevent chance of press coverage putting people off speaking**
* Disabilities: will be getting buddy system running in next few weeks
* Domestic:
* Entz: busy with clean up
* Food:
* Housing: living out talks now finished, would those living out fill in grant applications asap
* International Students:
* LGBTQ+:
* PoCRE: had well attended BME tea, my shoes are muddy (seems salient)
* Sarah Lawrence (Exchange Program):
* Sports Officer: sports funding will be upped, we are pushing for much bigger funding from college
* Staff Liaison:
* Suspended Students:
* Tech: Have done games poll, new games arriving soon, have updated TV connections, and limiting access to tech cupboard keys to relevant officers
* Trans: have just been elected, worked on queer week
* Welfare: welfare space yesterday was busy, luckily we had airbeds this week, am in process in handing over to new Welfare reps. SU members of the week are Entz, for organising fabulous QF, also LGBTQ officers. Sadly they’re not here now, busy clearing up
* Women: had pizza night last week, will be running poll for what to watch in film night. Also considering women’s predrinks in college bar. Next weekend there is an International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women, will be having events to raise funds subject to motion.
* Note university challenge will be second thing discussed
* MEETING RESUMES

**Motions**

MOVING TO UNI CHALLENGE DISCUSSION

* **Motion to clean up the SU constitution (2nd reading)**
* Proposed by Jack Wands, seconded by Lizzy Diggins
* This corrects some spelling mistakes and updates responsibilities to transfer to equalities officers rather than welfare reps
* Will be including provision for handovers
* And extending VP and treasurer manifesto last week
* Amendment: if a vote in SU is tied, Chair gets deciding vote rather than tortoise. Taken as friendly
* Point: reference to Women’s Rep does not need updating, refers to officer
* Point: if a motion is tied I think it should automatically pass or fail, why give the chair the vote
* Chairs give up their vote in interests of impartiality, only seems fair to given them some say
* Point that this is logically equivalent to giving Chair the vote
* VP: it already says if the Tortoise is dead the Chair gets the deciding vote
* Q. What if it’s a women\* only vote and the chair is a man?
* A. It’s an important point. Can be provided for
* Point: I think the tortoise is a fun part of the SU, also if Chair gets deciding vote, they get to vote having seen result of the vote, which is much more influential than a normal vote
* Point: it might be fun but it seems wrong that a Tortoise has more of a say than a member of the student body
* The tortoise is just a funny way of saying the motion passes if it’s a tied vote
* Yes the SU is in total turmoil if the tortoise dies on the day of an SU meeting, but that’s true anyway
* Point: two suggestions for resolving ties in SU meetings: online referendum or bringing it to a vote at the next SU meeting as first item on the agenda to promote turnout
* Point: sometimes it’s a nice memory in a bit of fun like giving the tortoise a vote. Giving the chair a deciding vote puts a lot of pressure on the chair, especially if it’s a deciding vote
* Everyone else can keep their ballot secret if they like
* Point: ties are very rare. If the chair does have a casting vote, they should act in a mechanistic way. Like in the House of Commons, they make the Speaker vote to extend discussion if possible
* I oppose giving the chair the vote as it threatens the neutrality of the chair, we should remove the provision that the chair gets a vote if the tortoise dies
* **Amendment withdrawn**
* Debate as to whether in future the Tortoise should instead vote for the status quo.
* Treasurer: propose one vote as to whether ties should be decided by Tortoise, and then a second vote on whether tortoise votes for or against change
* Point: given amendment has been withdrawn, can we discuss this later
* Agreed
* Vote on original motion
* **Motion passes**
* **Motion to change the number of Officers and Reps (2nd reading)**
* Proposed by Lizzy Diggins, seconded by Jack Wands
* VP: this keeps the same number of people working on Entz and Welfare, it just reduces the number of officers to one in each team
* This would stop college complaining about the size of committee, all this does is make liaison easier with college. This introduces no hierarchy
* Slight tweak to change Entz officer’s responsibilities, this is viewable on the agenda
* Q. Why does the candidate who gets the most votes become the Officer, this is a serious implied hierarchy?
* A. This is because they’re attending more meetings, doesn’t imply seniority. We don’t think the existing system which is similar causes a pecking order
* Q.Does Welfare Officer speak for Liberation officers?
* A. Only very rarely in a particular meeting, and this needs to be approved by Equalities committee
* Q.What’s the objective if there is no distinction between reps and officers?
* A. Only in attending meetings
* Trans rep will be changed to Trans officer, this distinction only exists because previous officers want it
* Entz: when working on Queerfest, we on Entz all needed to talk to college. Making only one person speak makes communication more complicated.
* A. This wouldn’t stop you, you’d just have one person who had to attend meetings
* Welfare: Sometimes if you’re a scientist you’ll be busy and will need another rep to speak for you.
* A. You’d be welcome to find someone to be Officer and simply be a Rep for example, there are ways around that
* Women’s: am unhappy with Welfare speaking for Equalities and lib roles (unless by agreement with that officer), this defeats the point of lib roles. Their voices need to be heard.
* A. Only so many people can sit on Welfare committee, what this does is say Welfare and Equalities committee has to meet more often and increases contact between welfare and liberation roles
* Women’s: we could require that the invitation to attend the college committee is extended to liberation officer rather than welfare rep, cannot have even the most well intentioned welfare officer speaking for a group they don’t represent
* Welfare: some things are technically liberation matters, but it wouldn’t be practical to invite every lib officer to every meeting
* Point: this particular motion doesn’t affect how much welfare officers represent liberation roles, I think this should be discussed separately, and college effectively decides who sits on each committee.
* Why can’t it be in each of the officer role descriptions that the team decides one of them to be an officer rather than link it to vote totals?
* Amendment: the four Entz officers, once elected, decide which of them will serve as officer
* Taken as friendly
* **Motion passes**
* **Motion to create an SU Liaison Committee (2nd reading)**
* Proposed by Lizzy Diggins, seconded by Jack Wands
* VP: this has changed its title, we describe the proposed body as a Liaison Committee rather than an Executive, which stresses it isn’t top down
* Current committees aren’t well attended and this motion makes sure smaller groups of the right people talk to each other with purpose
* Liaison committee would meet every fortnight, and other subcommittees a certain number of times a term
* Also we would add new officers to relevant subcommittees
* Q. What exactly is the role of Liaison Committee?
* A. These are all the officers that sit on college committees with me apart from equalities, and those who run the SU on a day to day basis. These are the people I am constantly messaging/meeting/asking to come to committee
* Q. Why add Sarah Lawrence and Arts officers to the Entz committee?
* A. Well as the SL officer runs socials I think this would be useful in breaking down distinction between SL and college events
* Friendly amendment that Arts Officer will not be added to Entz committees
* Point: should not have pizza in these meetings to save SU money
* This is agreed by the room
* Q. I want a clear sentence which describes what the committee does in the motion
* A. To be clear, these meetings would not discuss SU motions, and improving communication with the day to day operators of the SU
* Friendly amendment: Liaison Committee will not decide SU policy, it will manage day to day matters
* Move to vote
* **Motion passes**
* **Motion to fund the marking of the International Day of the Elimination of Violence against Women**
* Proposed by Rhian Friedeberg-Steward, seconded by Milo Thursfield
* Trigger warning: domestic violence, FGM
* Women’s: this is a chance to raise awareness of domestic violence and FGM in the UK, and show solidarity on Saturday with important cause
* We want to donate £150 to Oxford Rape Crisis Centre
* And £150 to another charity related to women’s rights, trans women and women\*s rights, but I want people in college to send submissions
* Friendly amendment to up donation to Oxford Rape Crisis centre to £250
* Point: this is a cool motion
* **Motion passes**
* **Motion to fund Lighthouse**
* Proposed by Margo Munro Kerr, seconded by Samuel Dunnet
* Lighthouse is an International Relations magazine contributed to by various Wadhamites
* We want £90 in exchange for some copies in the JCR
* **Motion passes**
* **Motion to Reimburse Dot’s Funk Odyssey for Missing Amp**
* Proposed by Liam Hyde, seconded by Lea Kambskard-Bennett
* Sadly we borrowed an amp from these people and it went missing, we need to replace it
* We want to buy slightly cheaper amp than in the motion
* **Motion passes**
* **Motion to fund Cuntry Living Zine**
* Proposed by Vida Adamczewski, seconded by Sophie Hubbard
* Proposer: this term’s issue has gone to print, the zine has a long history of advocating women’s rights
* Lots of Wadham contributors
* We want £300 subsidy in order to keep it free
* Q. Are you asking for anything from other colleges?
* A. We’re asking St Hilda’s and maybe the Ruskin
* Q. How much money do we actually have?
* A. About £13k a term funding from college
* **Motion passes**
* **Motion to pay for travel expenses**
* Proposed by Margo Munro Kerr, seconded by Samuel Dunnet
* Can we have £15 to fund filmmaker for Oxford for Dunkirk filmmaker to come to Wadham screening?
* **Motion passes**
* **Motion on ethical and transparent use of endowed funds**
* Proposed by Lucas Bertholdi-Saad, seconded by Shayaan Rehman
* Proposer: this mandates Jack to try to get college to move its £30 million in a Blackrock tracker fund on the FTSE 100 that includes fossil fuels to a similar fund which does not
* Friendly amendment to mandate both CEE Officer and President
* **Motion passes**
* **Emergency motion**
* CEE: there’s leftover money from last year’s Charities Fund, and I’d like £140 to fund my previous tea and coffee runs for the homeless in Oxford, I’d like £110 extra to keep this up
* Former CEE: there’s about £2,000 left over, the money’s there
* President: we can take money from this account to fund Rhian’s motion
* **Motion passes**

**Discussion points**

* **Laptop use at SU and committee meetings**
* Women’s: we do have quite long SU and Committee meetings, I know Chair, Comms, Pres etc absolutely need laptops, but in some meetings officers do go overboard, which can drag them out. People are writing essays in their meetings, and this does slow things down as we have to repeat stuff
* It would be good to minimise this to speed things up
* Point: I think 95% of the time we talk about irrelevant stuff in a long winded way, turnout would collapse if we ban laptops
* VP: from the perspective of the VP, I think it’s important people can access the agenda and live minutes, I don’t care if people are doing other stuff
* President: We’ve started live minuting, and we want people to consult this. If people are taking three hours out of their day to come to a meeting, we should encourage them
* Women’s: want to clarify that there won’t be a ban, but just discourage superfluous use, especially in committee. Also will be better if motions are on the projector, which we’re working on
* Point: I don’t think discouraging laptops will make things any quicker
* Q. Why are we discussing this in SU meetings if it’s about commitee?
* A. Well if people want laptop use in SU meetings then I will narrow scope to Committee meetings
* It’s our job as a democratic body to not be boring, not people’s job to listen
* Use of laptops promote anonymous points, and SU meetings are more slowed by people talking out of order or over the Chair
* Moving on
* **Uncontested elections**
* Moved to next term
* **Housing**
* President: me and VP viewed houses the college will use to make up the deficit, they’re all just over Magdalen bridge or around St Aldates. They’re really nice and will be a similar cost to students to living in college. We’re pushing for residents to pay termtime rent but will cover full year and utilities. We will be encouraging people to apply as groups before the room ballot.
* The idea is nobody is forced to not live in college.
* The room deficit will exist for two years. 24-32 non freshers will have to live out.
* What will happen with noise? Some people will have difficulties living in with noise.
* President: maybe when canvassing interest rooms, would could bump up those who need to avoid noise
* There will be a weekly cleaner for the rooms
* People who are interested will be able to see photos and floor plans but not visit
* Women’s: can we push for details on building works noise?
* President: college thus far have no details, but if they can’t guarantee anything about noise I will make it clear people should consider this when applying for the temporary rooms
* All the rooms are doubles, but roughly similar in size
* **Newspapers**
* President: atm SU pays £650 a term to the Tuck Shop to buy newspapers and magazines. I ran a recent poll on the SU FB group and the top vote was ‘don’t waste money on them’.
* Q. Is it possible to get a college online-only subscription?
* A.Will look into it
* It would be a nice thing to have, maybe in the Snug and women’s room
* President: I don’t think we should put them somewhere not everyone can get them
* Welfare: should we run an election rather than an FB poll?
* A. turnout will be low and people couldn’t propose new newspapers
* I want everyone to be able to read the newspapers rather than having to go and buy them individually
* Maybe we could reduce the number of papers we buy
* Perhaps we could get some key papers and rotate the more niche ones
* Would be good to get a newspaper rack
* Prez and Trez: we’ll get something
* President: currently we get 75 copies of Cherwell a week, in a set with Bang, Isis, etc, for £175 a term. I’ve noticed a lot of copies are left unread
* We will be reducing our subscription
* Q. That really should be going to a motion
* Cherwell’s finances are in a bad state, and this subscription would help keep the paper running and we should be funding investigative journalism
* If Wadham were to be the first college to cut its subscription it might cause a domino effect
* President: we were subscribed to 150 copies last year, we cut it to 75 without a motion.
* Also papers are more expensive when we buy a small number, so it’s a smaller reduction
* Women’s: from an environmental perspective, unread papers are really worrying. We could support Cherwell without buying surplus copies
* Treasurer: I’m proposing 50 copies a week subscription
* Point: if Cherwell wants our support, they should not report us inaccurately, like they did with the Uni Challenge discussion which leaked to the press. Our funding should be conditional on fair reporting on Wadham SU
* President: we weren’t looking to make a political point, just an efficiency to make
* Room agrees
* Point: we want Cherwell to do well, but this is not our problem if Cherwell isn’t selling copies
* Point: want to make sure Cherwell keeps going, and think people should read it
* I’m sure every JCR would like some influence over reporting, we always try to communicate with JCR officers
* Point: Cherwell has failed to communicate with Wadham SU
* Reply: everytime Cherwell runs a story people are unhappy, and it’s fast paced and we can’t fact check everything
* Cherwell isn’t really independent if it’s funded by the bodies it reports on. It isn’t our fault if we need to cut waste of newspapers
* Point: subscriptions to Bang and Isis are tied into this, and they are quality publications with staff in Wadham
* They’ll be hurt if we cut subscription, and we never defamed anyone
* SU should be encouraging people to read the things
* Point: though recently journalistic practices at Cherwell are bad, we shouldn’t be making funding contingent on good coverage
* Original point is retracted
* Point: we should separate demand from paper copies to wanting to fund Cherwell
* We can fund the magazines separately, this is a different question to our wasting paper
* Treasurer: think we should take a vote on our paper subscription and any publications that want funding, can come to the SU meeting next term and ask for funding
* Move to vote
* Q. Do we want to reduce the number of copies of Cherwell to which we subscribe?
* **Room votes yes**
* Q. Should it be cut to 50?
* **Room votes yes**
* **Gender composition of Wadham’s University Challenge team** (likely to be developed into an emergency motion depending on feeling in the room)
* Bar: at the last meeting we had a straw poll on the matter, but this wasn’t publicised so we want a full vote
* We have the options to enter an all male team, a team with a woman entrant or to enter no team at all
* Point: given a motion was passed three years ago reserving one place on the team for non-males, it would be regressive and complicit in the sexism of University Challenge to submit an all male team.
* Disappointed people are willing to submit an all male team
* Point: as someone who was part of Wadham’s last team, I think we have got a problem with too few women. Women\* only trials was a very good idea. It is important that the people who are best at quizzing should be on the team. I know a woman participant who frequently gets called on to fulfil a quota, and this makes her feel tokenised
* Point: unlike sports teams, which are generally divided between the sexes to begin with, it isn’t comparable to University Challenge. It is tough this close to the deadline, but this should be sorted well in advance for next year
* Point: We should be deciding a general point for next year, but this year we’ve already run the trials and the team has been picked. A man who was selected dropped out as he didn’t want to be on an all female team, and a woman should be put in his place
* Everyone could request their scores if they wanted them
* There was a gap of around 10 points in the 50 question test between the lowest performing male selected and the highest performing woman\*
* Q. To what extent did you take subjects into account and what impact did that have on gender?
* Both the highest scoring woman and the lowest scoring selected man were all rounders
* The man who dropped out specialised in History
* Point: Wouldn’t always expect a perfect balance, statistically you’d expect an all male team to arrive by chance about 20% of the time
* Sports teams are a local demonstration, this is nationwide
* Women’s: I take issue with term ‘meritocracy’, this is different from a boardroom but positive discrimination allows for new opinions and insight. Meritocracy is crap if you believe in any barriers like class and sex. I’m torn about how to go forward, but we know working hard enough doesn’t always get you where you want to go
* Point: I think women\* only trials were hastily organised, I know bar officers were under time pressure but this clashed with women’s weightlifting which wasn’t good. We should have had more trials
* Bar: it was only in the mixed trials when we saw female attendance was low that women’s trials were needed, we will specify that women’s trials must start from the beginning in the first place
* Point: there may be other things that make people’s lives difficult, like being working class. Telling someone they can’t get on the team because they identify as a man seems cruel
* Bar: it’s because University Challenge has a problem with gender that we saw a need to help correct it
* Watching UC was my first impression of Oxbridge, I saw four white male candidates with posh accents. I do have sympathy with your view
* Point: I think only the woman asked to be on the team can decide if she’s concerned about tokenism. We shouldn’t take that choice away. We should have a team with a woman on or not submit a team that doesn’t represent half of the college
* Point: If a woman doesn’t want to be selected for the team that’s her choice
* Point: scores on a test might not represent true ability, as people might grow in confidence
* Bar: in December Wadham will be entering trials to try to get on the spring recordings
* Bar: we’ve been given no information on how to run training
* Straw poll to be run later
* We need a contingency for what happens if the woman who might be selected doesn’t want it
* Woman only straw poll to be had: do you want to have a woman on the team, and then a vote, if she drops out do we submit a team or not at all?
* There is an empty space on the team atm, do we fill it with next ranking person (a man) or a woman?
* Having been to QuizSoc I find quizzing is something you can learn, but in other colleges with a culture it is a public schoolboy dominated thing
* I suggest setting up a college QuizSoc next year targeted at training underrepresented groups to hone their technique
* Women’s: we have to ask if this is about winning University Challenge or gender equality? I do personally see it as tokenistic to reserve a place for a woman, it would be more of a visual protest to refuse to enter a team, such a protest would make the papers. This is a long term problem, and I’m completely in favour of setting up a club to challenge it. Feels frustrating that this is what has got people talking about gender equality
* Point: women who are low scoring should not be placed on the team as she might be blamed if we lose
* Point: if we really want to make a statement, enter an all woman team and train them. Wadham women are really determined, and this would be better than sending just one woman
* We could set up a Wadham Women’s Quiz Soc to fix this in future regardless of what we do now. It is also apparent that private school kids are far far more likely to go on
* Motion to do a secret paper ballot
* This vote is for anyone who’s identity includes a woman. Give paper to everyone, and if they don’t identify as a woman they should vote abstain
* The first vote is whether to fill the spare place on the team with a woman
* “If she is willing, should we place a woman on the spare place in the team?”
* The second vote:
* “If she is not willing, should we enter an all male team?”
* Votes are not contingent on each other, so will be run at the same time
* What was the point gap between first and second highest ranking woman?
* A. Large. Another ten points
* Q. Could we run another trial?
* A. Difficult though we could phone the producers up and plead for an extension
* Votes will be run separately
* Vote on
* “If she/they is willing, should we fill the empty space on the team with a woman?”
* Greg will be counting ballots, hand votes to him
* 7 abstentions, 2 no, 15 yes. **Yes wins**
* “In the event that the team ends up being all-male, should we submit the team?”
* **No wins:** college wouldn’t field an all male team if women invited do not want to enter

**Oxford SU**

* Communications: motions coming up to Council are: whether to call for a ‘carbon levy’ on termly Battels of about £5 per term to offset the average level of carbon emissions per student; whether to lobby the University to fund free mobile bike repairs for students as it already does for staff, and whether to support the City Council plans to ban all petrol and diesel vehicles from the city centre in the next few years
* Point: does carbon offsetting not defeat objectives to actually reduce emissions?
* I think green issues have been on the back burner of late and this would raise their profile
* Where would the levy money go?
* A. The Clean Earth charity
* President: there is no consensus on the matter, people who feel strongly on the matter should come to Council at the Oxford Foundry on Wednesday as one of Wadham’s delegates! They will be giving out food and drink at the social after.

**AOB**

* Women’s: what kind of non-cheery event can we hold to raise funds for the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women
* **Joseff is elected Chair of SU meetings for next term**
* The room congratulates Michael for his great work chairing them this term