

Magdalene Amalgamation Club Lent Meeting

Held on January 30th 2023 on Microsoft Teams

Members present

Senior treasurer Tijmen Euser (TE)

JCR representatives: Adriana Midkiff (AM), Caredig ap Tomas (CT), James Hardy (JH)

MCR representatives Jan H Bluemle (JHB), Jasper Sangan also serving as **MCR treasurer** (JS)

JCR President Rory Gavin (RG)

JCR treasurer Stephen Cowley (SCO)

Captain of the Boats Liella Uddin (LU)

Boat Club Treasurer Mark Brown (MB)

Non-Sports representative Sam Clarke (SCA)

Sports representative Ben Weidman (BW)

Amalgamation Secretary Christian Keeping (CK)

Apologies for absence

MCR president James Ball

A quorum was reached as per regulations outlined in the constitution.

Objectives

TE: The objective of this meeting is to review revised bids and to assess new bids in particular May Ball, Tennis and the JCR

CK: As agreed at the previous meeting I have been able to reach all the societies that bid last year the Magdalene Doctoral Society is inactive and the Basketball Club have decided they have sufficient reserves for the year. The Tennis Society have however bid.

New Bids

JCR

Bid was for £8981.

JHB: What do the bids sum to and how does this relate to funds available to us.

TE: bids are for £45,510.27 and we have £34,025.97 available, however we may still be able to increase funding on last year as doctoral and basketball societies did not bid.

CT: Does the amal club have reserves

TE: No I have confirmed with Helen Foord (the Busar) that 34,025.97 is the budget

JHB: JCR bid is generally reasonable. However, punt repairs and maintenance cost the JCR £1000 whereas the MCR spends £800.

CT: JCR fleet is different and receives more use.

JHB: JCR have bid for gym soundproofing is this the JCR's responsibility or should the college cover this.

JH: Issue is that if Amal refuse funding the college may choose not to fund the sound proofing and then the current noise issue will not be rectified.

JHB: The JCR also contributes £1000 toward gym maintenance what is this?

CT: The college requires we pay this toward gym maintenance.

JHB: I am happy with Amal approving website subscription TV license, sexual health supplies, gender recognition funds, monthly subscription fee, animal therapy and societies establishment fund. However, the sports day is a significant cost. The MCR who are also traveling to Oxford are bidding for the £ 1500 whereas JCR bid is for £ 2500. Could the JCR liaise with MCR to obtain a better quote.

SCO: Through we initially budgeted the £2500 based on when we last travelled to Oxford we have now received a much higher quote now.

JHB: What is green and charities budget spent on?

SCO: This is used by the green and charities officer in the past this has been spent on bird boxes and running the plant sale.

JHB: JCR also receives £ 500 charity donations and also has £300 going out in charity donations why is this?

SCO: This is all run through the charities officer we receive charitable donations which we use to organise events, these make us a profit some of which we donate to charity.

JHB: Stash for committee members and JCR committee nonessential sums up to more than £1000 what is this spent on.

SCO: We don't receive Amal funds toward this, stash for committee members is used as uniform at official events, we also ask committee members to contribute to this. Non-essential items are mainly refreshments used to encourage attendance at open meetings.

JHB: Most significant item is the room refurbishment. You will be spending £ 6,500 mostly from reserves why do you require £ 600 from Amal for this.

RG: This would be to begin the project. The refurbishment will also make a significant contribution to the lives of JCR members especially since there has been no dedicated JCR room since COVID.

SCO: The £ 6500 is also very reasonable considering how much the college have quoted for the work.

Grant of £8981 was provisionally agreed.

May Ball

Bid was £6,400.

TE: I have just been informed by the Bursar that for legal reasons we are unable to fund the May Ball

JH: Are there alternative sources from which the May Ball can seek funding.

SCA: I believe that the May Ball has already received some funding directly from college.

Bid was provisionally rejected.

Tennis

Bid was for £180.

AM: I would suggest approving the bid bar the £60 for the tennis rackets which would leave £120.

Grant of £120 agreed.

Revised bids

Liquid Netball

Bid was for £230.

AMm: £80 for the league fees and £45 for the coppers are reasonable however the kit is a concern. I think there needs to be a general policy on this. I discussed this with CK who noted in previous meeting it was suggested that we could fund kit if it was passed on to next years team. Aside from kit laundry fees and face paint could be paid by them and are not essential. I suggest £125.

CK: I recently emailed the captain about this she indicated that she would ensure kit was passed on.

AM: Given this I would recommend £200 including the kit.

SCA: We need to establish a policy, so we know who received kit last year

BW: If we are approving kit on the understanding it is passed on, we should approve laundry fees as if the kit is held centrally by the captain then it is much more likely to be retained.

JHB: However, we also need to ensure consistent policy on kit.

CK: I have confirmed with all societies that bid for kit that they plan to pass it on.

CT: The issue is with clubs such as men's football who have retained kit every year. But consulting last years bid liquid netball did not bid for kit.

CK: I will put which clubs received kit in my hand over notes and suggest these should not receive kit funding next year.

AM: So, revised suggestion is full amount minus the £6 for face paint.

Grant of £224 was agreed.

South Asian Society

Bid was for £380.00.

AM: Main issue is that the bid is quite vague. However I am more willing to approve food which is a major part of the bid as this is central to the societies purpose.

CT: I would also be inclined to fund the religious aspects of the bid as these seem essential to the societies purpose.

AM: I suggest we give them the £180.00 for religious and cultural events because that was their priority.

CK: I emailed the treasurer about the issue with the vagueness of the bid. I think the reason is that they are new, so they don't have much to base the bid on.

LU: Is the JCR willing to support them further through the society's establishment fund?

CT: Possibly though we don't want to exhaust the fund on one society.

AM: This suggests £180 would be appropriate.

Grant of £180 was agreed.

Men's Football

Bid was for £935.

AM: I would suggest accepting league fees and referee costs as these are essential but especially in view of CT's points about their history with the kit, I would suggest rejecting the kit bid.

TE: Their bid has also nearly doubled from last year

BW: This is partly due to our having lost access to our account.

AM: I would also accept the footballs as these are essential. But I would reject the miscellaneous items and the dinner. As the first is too vague and the second is not essential to the societies purpose.

BW: The miscellaneous costs would cover a pump, a hold all and training equipment.

CT: This would yield a sum of £ 585. The JCR would also be willing to donate some left-over hold all's this would reduce it to £565.

BW: Kit is also very important for the club's unity we would also promise to retain kit.

SCA: Perhaps Amal could make a contribution to the kit to make it more accessible. However, the problem with this is that if we are asking players to pay in part for kit then we cannot reasonably ask for it to be handed on to next years team.

JH: Given the men's football club's history with kit maybe it would be better just to make a contribution then.

CT: I suggest Amal contribute around a quarter of the cost per item this would cost us £125. I would also suggest that we adopt a policy of contributing up to £5 per kit item.

Grant of £680 was agreed.

Badminton

Bid was for £2456.

AM: All items on the bid are reasonable but I am concerned that they are not reducing their bid due to now agreeing to charge membership fees.

TE: Currently membership fees are approximately £400

AM: If they charged £10 per member, they could raise £500 so we could reduce grant to £1956.

TE: This would still be an increase on last year

AM: however, this would reflect inflation in the court fees. With the £500 membership fees they should be able to cover shuttlecock standard, racket, racket bag, as well as the court fee for the Easter term without amal support.

Grant of £1956 was agreed.

Ladies' netball

Bid was £234.89.

JHB: All very reasonable however we need to consider new kit policy of offering up £5 per item.

CT: This would also allow us to cut the laundry fees

Grant of £216.89 was agreed.

Fives Club

Bid was £116.59.

JHB: Aside from the welfare budget all aspects of this bid seems reasonable. As this is covered by JCR and MCR we should not accept other welfare bids, this would also ensure consistency with approach taken to the South Asian Society.

TE: Numbers on this bid are very confusing I am unsure whether they are bidding to £116 or for £589.

JHB: Bid is definitely for £116, this would mean if we cut the welfare we would be offering £16.

CK: I have emailed them and I can confirm they are bidding for the lower figure.

TE: This seems like a low figure but they have significant reserves that it would encourage them to spend.

Grant of £16.59 was agreed.

Whiskey Society

Bid was for £280.

JHB: bid is generally reasonable however they have rounded and miscalculated the bid should, covering the £10 deficit they are currently in, their itemised bid comes to £245 not £280.

TE: I am happy to accept this since whiskey is obviously essential to the society's operation.

Grant of £245 was agreed.

History Society (Peckard society)

Bid was for £900.

JHB: willing to accept all items bar catering as this is just providing food to members. In particular since the garden parties to do not serve an academic purpose the funding for these should be cut.

Perhaps the parlour dinner could be funded if it was open to non-members and was clearly advertised.

CT: I agree especially since the history DoS will have a budget for covering these sorts of costs.

JH: I am one of the societies co-presidents and would be happy to ensure that it was more widely advertised next year. As well as this it has a clear academic purpose as each year we invite an eminent historian to give a talk.

JHB: accepting the above then we should deduct £120 from the £900 bid.

Grant of £780 was agreed.

(JHB left the meeting. The meeting remained quorate as 4 of 5 voting members remained present)

Ladies football club

Bid was for £234.89.

JH: All aspects of the bid are reasonable and essential to the functioning of the club bar the transport costs which need to be discussed further and probably reduced.

SCA: We also need to decide how to apply the kit policy here.

JH: The Ladies football team do not have the same track record of not returning kit as the men's side there is every reason to think the captain will ensure kit is retained and this seems to be the plan we as such need to note for next year's committee that their kit was fully funded so they cannot bid again for this next year. On transport costs these may be reasonable if they play matches at further out colleges such as Homerton.

TE: However, this is well within cycling or even walking distance.

JH: However, it may be necessary to transport heavy kit bags. As such I would suggest one player could travel by taxi carrying kit. This would allow us to reduce the transport costs.

Grant of £216.89 was agreed.

Medical society

Bid was £630.

JH: Generally reasonable bid however the welfare should be rejected as discussed earlier and the stash access subsidy requires further discussion.

SC: Stash is not essential to the societies purpose

Grant of £440 was agreed.

MCC (Magdalene Climbing Club)

Bid was for £405.

JH: Whilst the bid has been reduced significantly from the initial £1000, I would still suggest we reject it entirely since the MCC could end up simply subsidising core members climbing.

CT: However, it is reasonable for amal to subsidise new climbers to try it out.

TE: The concern is though that left over funds would be used to subsidise core members.

SCA: I suggest we require they keep a record of who's entry was subsidised which they will need to pass on to next year's committee. Also looking at the climbing gyms prices they are £11.50 for off peak entry not £13.50 as is indicated in the bid which would allow us to reduce it to £345.

JH: We should also request a list of members now to ensure all climbers are genuinely new.

Grant of £345 was agreed with conditions as indicated above.

May Ball (further discussion)

CK: I have just now received an email from the May Ball committee who argue that despite the Busar's view the May Ball is entitled to amal consideration.

TE: I have forwarded this to the Busar, but I expect the response will continue to be a hard no.

CT: Since we are awaiting the Busar's reply should we make a provisional decision in case they do change their mind.

SCA: However, despite this there is no case for Amal funding since the May Ball does not make a regular significant contribution to college life. It would also force us to make major cuts elsewhere.

CT: Agreed but this is a separate point to whether the committee should discuss the issue at all.

TE: I would be happy for such a discussion to proceed.

JH: I think there is a case for funding them as it costs approximately £200 per ticket and this is unaffordable for many students. Since the May Ball bid aims to advance accessibility this arguably contributes to college life. It would also help to protect the Magdalene May Ball's white tie tradition.

LU: I Agree but I think the issue isn't about the desirability of access subsidies it's whether or not this is a good use of amal funds for this which I contend it is not.

CT: It also seems that they have by already been providing the subsidy and essentially assumed they would receive Amal funds. However I don't think this provides any reason to fund them.

SCa: As well as this I don't believe they have received Amal funds in the past doing so now would risk setting an unfortunate precedent for future committees.

CK: Just to confirm looking at their bid, which should include all sources of funding, they do not receive college funds and are funded wholly from ticket sales.

JH: The concern is then that this could reduce the quality of the May Ball.

CK: However just because they have already sold the tickets this does not mean we should be forced into funding them whatever the merits of the bid.

LU: I agree they have created this issue themselves and should seek some alternative way of resolving it perhaps by seeking additional sponsors.

CK: The fundamental issue is that regardless of access concerns the May Ball is clearly a luxury and we shouldn't look to fund it by reducing contributions to things like societies welfare funds.

SCA: perhaps they could receive some funds if there is any money is left over after giving out other grants.

TE: Generally any left over funds go to JCR and/or MCR so any funding for the May Ball would reduce this.

JH: What is the amal committee's projected total spend this year. If there are left over funds it might be reasonable to fund the ball as it doesn't exist to make a profit and any money spent would go to students.

RG: Any funding for the May Ball would have an unacceptable knock of effect on the MCR and JCR's funding.

LU: Even if we underspend this year, funding the May Ball would set a precedent for future years when amal might not underspend.

TE: We are approximately £2000 over budget based on my estimates at the moment so I don't think funding them is a sensible option.

CT: As well as this it would not make much difference to them since it is only about 2% of their overall budget

CK: There isn't really an accessibility concern as they have already sold tickets at a reduced price which is hardly something they can revoke.

TE: As well as this the Busar has confirmed that we are unable to fund the Ball

CT: If more funds were available I would consider supporting their bid in part but at the moment it has to be rejected entirely. Relatedly how is the size of the amal budget decided.

TE: The budget is decided through the bursars and the governing body

CT: Given this if more funding were made available it would be reasonable for amal to subsidise the May Ball

TE: I am happy to raise this in my report to the governing body.

Application for grant was rejected.

MCR

Bid was for £11,095.

CT: No revisions have been made of the MCR bid. In particular I object to the £ 1200 for BOPs though I would support £60 pounds for Porter supervision per BOP as the JCR have bid for this. As such BOP funding should be reduced £120.

JS: I have discussed the bid with the committee I am happy to speak to issues raised at the last meeting. We are happy to reduce the Yoga from £1920 to £1280. We will do this either by reducing the number of events or by requesting contributions.

CT: I am happy with this

JS: I have also discussed idea of the SCR partially funding parlour talks. We already have MCR-SCR events which they partially fund. Parlour talks are separate, and the SCR will not fund this. As the JCR has shown the Oxford trip is costly. We are planning to rent mini-vans and drive them ourselves, it may as such end up costing less than £1500 though we are happy to have reduced funding next year to make up for underspending on this. The table tennis table is more of an administrative issue. This would be used by both JCR and MCR, but it would be difficult to administer joint funding, so we request the MCR sports fund is not reduced. On BOPs we are hoping to invite bands which is costly.

CT: I am still not supportive of what is essentially a drinking event being funded by Amal.

JS: Yes the plan is to serve less alcohol at our BOPs any alcohol would be funded by ticket sales. Amal funds would be spent on the band alone.

CT: Does the BOP item include porter supervision.

JS: Historically we have had porter supervision.

SCO: If you are charging £5-£10 for tickets this would suggest you are paying £600 pounds per BOP for bands, which seems excessive.

JS: The last time we rented and a band it cost us £300 for an hour and half.

CT: However, this cost is unlikely to scale linearly with time, so it is unlikely to cost £600 for 3 hours.

SCO: How do you propose to reduce alcohol at these events.

JS: We plan to limit how much we buy in.

RG: Despite the reduced alcohol consumption it is still funding an event at which alcohol will be served. And we are not looking to fund to these.

JS: We are not funding this aspect of the BOP.

TE: In the bid the BOP item is intended to cover decorations etc is this correct

JS: No this is a miscommunication the cost is primarily for musical entertainment.

CT: Can I ask if members who haven't sat on JCR/MCR committees if we should fund BOPs

LU: I would only be in favour of funding say minimal decorations.

CT: Precedent from JCR is to fund either £60 each or to other no funding it all

(SCA left the meeting, SCA is not a voting member so the meeting remained quorate)

MBC

Bid was for £10,035.

JS: No serious concerns we have now noted the bid is for £10,350 not £11,350 there is also a slight accounting issue with the reserves. Reserves are based on their bank statement closer to £18,000 to £19,000 rather than £14,000 as indicated in the statement, presumably they have received more funds since then. Based on discussion of the kit before perhaps the MBC could bid for more funds.

CT: We obviously already fund the MBC at a high level so it would be unreasonable to fund kit.

LU: We have no desire for Amal to fund kit.

TE: The bid is not an increase on the amount approved last year so is very reasonable in this sense.

CT: We also considered the MBC carefully last year.

Grant of £10,035 was accepted.

JCR

TE: This has already been discussed but we now have a fuller picture of the funds available. There where no specific issues raised earlier.

SCO: I would like to offer the bigger picture on the JCR bid. It is essentially last years £5,600 plus £2,500 for sports day which there is precedent for and £600 for starting the refurbishment.

CT: No concerns bar the gym sound proofing which the college might be willing to fund and the Sky subscription which is new. But since both JCR and MCR are bidding for this, I think it is very reasonable.

JS: Would it be possible for the MCR and JCR to have a joint subscription?

CT: This was not done when both last had a subscription and I don't believe that it is possible. A joint subscription would have to be in one room perhaps the bar.

JS: This would be acceptable to me as MCR treasurer.

RG: Since a joint subscription would be limited to one room, we are keen for JCR to receive separate funds for this.

CT: I think a separate sky subscription is reasonable

SCO: We have not paid this over COVID, and we also have not had a JCR room we would like the subscription to help us bring back the JCR as a social hub.

CT: The new JCR room is unlikely to be in operation until Easter Term or perhaps Michaelmas so we can reduce the subscription time. We could also cut the gym sound proofing if college where willing to pay, we could put this firmly in hand over notes for next year that if the college will not pay for this then we will fund it next year.

JH: However, the building in which the gym is situated is undergraduate, so this really is a JCR issue.

TE: At the moment in order to meet the budget we need to reduce JCR-MCR approximately to 13,000

RG: This could be largely funded by cutting the MCR themed BOPs.

CT: I would support cutting this to £120

TE: After that the MCR budget would still increase on last year, we would still need to save £200

CT: We could also cut the Sky subscription to 8 months which would reduce it to the target

JS: Obviously given the level of percentage increase in JCR we need to avoid a year-on-year increase.

TE: These are primarily one-off costs like the refurbishment or biannual costs for the sports day

CT: This is basically a return to pre-COVID, funding the JCR also has more members we also cover the operating costs of the gym.

TE: The MCR also has significant reserves.

JS: This is largely due to our financial year it probably will probably fall to around £10,000 soon.

TE: We have approximately £100 left over.

JS: This could be used to fund an additional BOP.

TE: That leaves us £5 over which is acceptable. This is a reasonable conclusion.

Grant of £9435 was agreed for the MCR.

Grant of £8741 was agreed for the JCR.

Grand total of grants agreed was £34,025.97.

Other matters arising

CK: I would like to revise the guidelines and the bid form for next year.

TE: Yes

CT: Use best judgements to make revised guidelines based on these meetings and vote by circulation.

CK: Is there an update on the JCR registration portal.

CT: Would make sense for the JCR to give a place for societies to register and advertise this would be a requirement on receiving Amal funds.

TE: We also need to ensure that societies plan accounts hand over better.

CK: On the tennis society the plan to use the JCR account.

TE: would be happy to suggest using JCR/MCR in guidelines for next year

CT: Yes, with JCR and MCR permission in each case.