

St Hugh's JCR Meeting 4 Minutes
Sunday 10th June 2018, 8th Week TT18, JCR

1. Reports from members of the JCR Committee
2. Statement by the JCR Treasurer of the balance of the term's motion budget and the balance of any other budget relevant to that meeting
3. Late motions for admission
4. Action motions for debate asking for funding
5. Action motions for debate not asking for funding
6. Statement motions for debate
7. Items for discussion
8. Any other business

1. Reports from members of the JCR Committee.

President - Alex Yeandle

- OUSU Council
- Meeting with Bursar
- Meeting with Ella re welfare motion
- A few end of termy admin bits

Vice President - Roxy Orloff

- Summer formal tastiness (in short I moved tickets to now - go get em, and allowed guests)
- Charities elections results, GoF motion results
- RO/IC information sent out
- Will do the WEQ thing this week - though I'd like a full list of all the positions we're appointing etc etc etc
- Discussed the third welfare rep motion
- Trying my best to sort the washing machines but u no, Magz

Secretary - Alex Buchanan

- Put together Constitutional Changes exhaustive list, and Constitutional Changes Accompanying Document with list of all constitutional change motions
- Minutes
- Constitutional Changes email to Jack
- Made list of Constitutional Change motions that need to be drafted over the summer
- OUSU Council
- Admin regarding Travel Grants and IC/RO elections

Treasurer - Aditya Badaya

- Blues funding process is done.
- Also preparing an outline process for El Presidente's request to explain the entire Blues Funding process.

Access Officer - Jessy McCabe

- Sent email to Thea about a collection still not back.

- Got volunteers for tours.
- Alt pros paper version:
 - Meeting with Jack re design
 - Got a few people to write articles and days in the life
 - All articles written now just need to edit and put with design
- Got volunteers for alt pros videos and filmed 4.

Welfare and Equal Opportunities Officers - Ella Heinz & Ryan Simpson (BOTH ABSENT)

- Went to welfare committee: just a reminder that the nurse is now an official welfare officer in college and does weekly welfare events! She sends around emails so make sure to keep an eye out for them!
- Also, you can get access to all of your medical information online - if you don't have access yet you can get that by going to the GP with your passport and then you can access results and prescriptions and stuff online!

Entz Reps - Silvia Mills & Joe Higton Durrant

- Love Island event
- T20 Cricket event

LGBTQ Rep - Ro Green

- Did pres for plush in the JCR last Tuesday
- Getting people to sign up for LGBT 101 workshop training this Friday 5-630pm
- Had training in Hugh's
- Discussed and researched morph suit plans

International Rep - Afrah Shibu (ABSENT)

- Hosted Iftar night on Sunday
- Emailed and arranged meeting with Colin about bike racks

Charities Rep - Naomi Hirst

- Went above carls head to rahele and finally got charity formal money
- Did charities election and sorting out the results
- Had meeting with college about RAG ball

E&E Rep - Anna Pathak

- Can crusher installed
- Waste audit completed
- Met burser about divestment. Set up a little divestment

Sports & Socs Rep - Sheng Ho

- In contact with Magdalena for gym repairs
- Organising college varsity sports day

Careers Officer - Quentin Dercon

- Nothing to report

DoDO - Jack Miller (ABSENT)

- Met with Jessy to plan Alt - Prospectus

- Started preliminary designs
- Lots of constitutional updates on website

Freshers Rep - Matt Clark

- Sent off parent letters to Thea
- Talked to a guy about having the jcr lunch in Dicky P
- Organised formal payment with the same guy
- Freshers guide is with Thea
- Paid off club tickets
- Got freshers helpers

2. Statement by the JCR Treasurer of the balance of the term's motion budget and the balance of any other budget relevant to this meeting.

£197.06

3. Late motions for admission

Motion F – Golf Motion

THE JCR NOTES:

- The St Hugh's Golf Society was created on May 27th 2018
- This date is beyond the amalgamated funding date
- Therefore, the Golf Society has no funding
- It currently has 15 members on its Facebook page which is growing

THE JCR BELIEVES:

- Funding would help the Society get started and involve more people
- Golf is a sport that not many have tried
- We would like get more people interested in golf
- However, it is a sport that is not free to play
- For someone to play they must pay a green fee, rent clubs and buy balls and tees
- Going to the driving range to practice also typically costs around £6 per person
- The Golf club is located in Headington so transport to and from can become expensive
- Some funding from the JCR would help pay for transport and for people to give golf a try without having to spend their own money
- The Golf Society will only ask for money from the JCR this one time as next year it will apply for amalgamated funding

THE JCR RESOLVES:

- To give £180 to the Golf Society to cover the aforementioned costs

Proposer: Christopher Shah

Secunder: Alexander Hine

Charlotte Acherson:

What would the money be for?

Chris Shah:

As it says in the motion – travel, green fee, renting clubs and buying balls and tees.

Aditya Badeya:

Societies applying for amalgamated funding should jump through various quite arduous hoops. For example, they need a constitution, with signature support, society bank account with financial control of college, etc

Chris Shah:

We will have this when we apply for amalgamated funding next year.

Aditya Badeya:

Another consideration is the fact that these amalgamated funding requirements enable society spending accountability. Societies on average got 76% of what they asked for this year, and a number of new societies applied this year and had to meet all the necessary requirements. Skipping due process creates bad precedent – a society should go through the amalgamated funding process.

Joe Higton Durrant:

There are far more objectionable reasons to not fund – it seems silly to get hung up on bureaucracy.

Chris Shah:

The whole point of this it's to try to get people interested.

Harrison Engler:

Can we possibly friendly-amend the motion to hold the money in the JCR fund until the amalgamated funding procedure is met?

Chris Shah:

We don't wish to amend the motion.

Alex Yeandle:

The point is that everyone had to jump through the hoops – we would be mugging off other societies and setting bad precedent if we allow the funding of this new society.

Alex Hine:

It's to get people involved now – it's a summer sport!

Alex Yeandle:

We've got one week left of summer. What are you going to do between now and next Saturday...?

PASSES

4. Action motions for debate asking for funding.

5. Action motions for debate not asking for funding.

Motion B'': Motion to clarify the role of the Returning Officer

THE JCR NOTES:

1. Currently, the role of overseeing the administration of JCR elections using the Alternative Vote (AV) (Electoral Reform Society 1997) system falls upon the JCR Vice President due to lack of clarity in the constitutional role of the Returning Officer under Appendix E;
2. According to Appendix A, section A9(b), the Vice President is not currently obligated to oversee the administration of JCR elections;
3. The role of the Returning Officer, according to Appendix E, is "the administration of elections";
4. Appendix E should therefore be amended in order to clarify the Returning Officer's constitutional role.
5. In order to encourage people to run for the position and to enable consistency in the administration of elections, the post tenure should be elongated and granted a room ballot privilege.

THE JCR BELIEVES:

1. The constitutional role of the Returning Officer should be clarified in order to prevent the overburdening of the JCR Vice President, and ensure that the Returning Officer sufficiently undertakes their job.
2. The Returning Officer should be a year-long position, enabling consistency and the exercise of amalgamated expertise in the use of the AV online voting system.
3. The Returning Officer role should be incentivised with room ballot privileges.
4. The toughest part of the RO job is the JCR Committee Election at the end of Michaelmas Term...
In order to prevent ROs simply resigning before they have to do this, the room ballot reward must be contingent on their completion of 3 Full Terms in the post, and they must be prevented from standing in the Committee Election (and getting out of overseeing the administration for it!). The administration of the JCR Committee Election must be a mandatory part of the role.
5. The RO Appendix should be simplified to include the following:
 1. an exact description and list of the responsibilities
 2. when and how the RO is elected, and the duration of that tenure
 3. what happens in the instance that the RO wishes to run in one of the elections which they are overseeing
 4. a simpler process to appoint an Acting Returning Officer from the Exec Committee in the instance that the RO has to miss attending one JCR Meeting
 5. a room ballot incentive to encourage people to run

THE JCR RESOLVES:

1. To redraft Appendix E to the following:

Appendix E
The JCR Returning Officer

The Election of the JCR Returning Officer

E1

The JCR Returning Officer shall be elected in the 4th Meeting of Trinity Term. Elections will be held by Alternative Vote (AV) (Electoral Reform Society 1997), administered by the current Returning Officer. The JCR Returning Officer shall hold this position for the next three Full Terms.

E2

In the instance that no candidates run for the position of JCR Returning Officer, the position passes to the Vice President as Acting Returning Officer as per E10, until the 4th meeting of the following term, when a further election for the position of JCR Returning Officer will take place.

E3

The JCR Returning Officer may not also be the JCR Independent Chair or the JCR President.

The Role of the JCR Returning Officer

E4

The JCR Returning Officer shall oversee the administration of all JCR elections. This involves explaining the procedure for, and giving adequate notice of, all upcoming elections via email, as well as being the primary overseer of the use of the Alternative Vote (AV) (Electoral Reform Society 1997) online voting system.

The relevant elections overseen by the Returning Officer include:

- a. JCR Committee Elections (The JCR Constitution, s.7);*
- b. WEQ elections and by-elections (B2(d));*
- c. Vote subsequent to the Charities Meeting (H8);*
- d. Travel Grants votes (F24);*
- e. Motions put to online secret ballot (Standing Orders, 1.15.5);*
- f. JCR Returning Officer elections (E3);*
- g. JCR Independent Chair elections.*

E5

The Executive Committee must nominate one of its members to oversee the reading of election results alongside the Returning Officer, and the Independent Chair must also be in attendance.

E6

The JCR Returning Officer shall attend all JCR Meetings during their three terms of office. If they must miss a JCR Meeting, they should appoint an Acting Returning Officer from the JCR Executive Committee for that JCR Meeting. The JCR Returning Officer must inform the Independent Chair of such an appointment prior to the JCR Meeting.

E7

The JCR Returning Officer may not stand in any election during the year for which they hold the post. If they wish to stand, they must temporarily vacate the post prior to opening nominations, with the exception of the JCR Committee Election (E5). The JCR Returning Officer will return to their post subsequent to the reading of the election results.

E8

The JCR Returning Officer may not stand in the JCR Committee Election occurring in the year for which they hold the post, and may not temporarily or permanently vacate the role in order to do so. Overseeing the administration of the JCR Committee Election is a mandatory role of the JCR Returning Officer.

E9

In the instance that the position of JCR Returning Officer becomes temporarily vacant, as per E4, the JCR Vice-President shall be appointed as Acting Returning Officer, and assume the powers and responsibilities of the JCR Returning Officer. Should the JCR Vice-President resign from this position, the Executive Committee shall nominate one of their number to become Acting Returning Officer.

E10

The JCR Returning Officer shall be granted a room ballot score immediately beneath the lowest position of the JCR Committee, contingent on their completion of all three Full Terms in the post, including the mandatory oversight of the administration of the JCR Committee Election.

E11

In the instance that the JCR Returning Officer permanently resigns, the JCR Vice-President shall be appointed as Acting Returning Officer, and assume the powers and responsibilities of the JCR Returning Officer until at the very latest the 4th meeting of the term of resignation, when there will be another JCR Returning Officer election, as per E3. The JCR Returning Officer will then hold this position for the next 3 Full Terms.

In the instance of the JCR Returning Officer's permanent resignation, the JCR Committee has the discretion as to when to hold the next election – the very latest being the 4th meeting of the term of resignation.

Should the JCR Vice-President resign from the position of Acting Returning Officer in the interim, the Executive Committee shall nominate one of their number to become Acting Returning Officer.

Proposer: Alex Buchanan

Seconder: Alex Yeandle

PASSES FOR THE SECOND TIME

Motion C – Workshops Motion

THE JCR NOTES:

1. There are usually 3 compulsory workshops for freshers in fresher's week (Sexual Consent, LGBTQ+ and Racial Awareness)
2. There is no existing policy mandating the running of said workshops
3. Last year there was no vote on whether the workshops should run
4. It is difficult/impossible to find information on the content of said workshops
5. The content of the workshops is decided by activist organisations
6. There is no evidence that the workshops are effective
7. There are limited studies into the impact of similar workshops
8. The studies that do exist suggest similar mandatory workshops have the opposite to desired effect
9. There has been no independent ethical review of the workshops

THE JCR BELIEVES:

1. It is risky to run such workshops without evidence of effectiveness
2. There are many potential ethical concerns with running such workshops
3. The JCR has a responsibility not to run events that have a high risk of damaging both individual freshers and the college environment as a whole

THE JCR RESOLVES:

- ~~1. To demand an empirical study demonstrating the effectiveness of each of the workshops~~
2. To demand an independent ethics board review the content to identify and eliminate any potential ethical problems
- ~~3. To refuse to run the workshops until both the above have been completed~~

Proposed: Samuel Dicks

Seconded: Alex Cheema

Factual points

Harrison Engler:

Of whom would these demands be made?

Samuel Dicks:

Of Oxford University Students Union.

Naomi Hirst:

Can you please elaborate on what you see to be 'ethical concerns'?

Samuel Dicks:

My answer is threefold. There are risks associated with the workshops not being assessed as properly appropriate for people with mental disorders (e.g. mental anxiety), and if the workshops are dishonest or intentionally misleading, it could lead to conflicts of interest. A

further risk is the large inductive leap between invoking certain statistics and recommending certain action.

Hannah Taylor:

Is this motion being presented at this JCR meeting so that there is no time to assess the motion and therefore so that there are no workshops?

Samuel Dicks:

Reason why this was done now and not earlier is due to numerous attempts to try to get information from the Oxford University Student Union about how the workshops are done. Have still only been able to get information relating to the LGBTQ workshop.

Dom Clark:

Do you have any evidence to support your assertion that the workshops are ineffective? Any citations?

Samuel Dicks:

[refers to a Harvard Business Review study: <https://hbr.org/2016/07/why-diversity-programs-fail>]

Ben Peacock:

Have got all the information – emailed the Student Union and they emailed back to me all the information that I requested immediately. Statistical analysis from OUSU Sexual Consent Workshops Feedback Report 2016 shows that 99% stated that they found the consent workshops at least “slightly useful”, and 83% of undergrads found the workshops helpful or very helpful.

Samuel Dicks:

It should be between 1 and 2 days to give them a chance to reflect.

Ben Peacock:

Fine, but these are positive statistics. In addition the NUS Consent Pilot Report Feedback showed that 87% would recommend the workshops, 91% agreed or strongly agreed that they had taken away a better understanding of sexual consent, and 94% said that the workshops were facilitated in a safe and comfortable environment. It is notable that this was a pilot of the consent workshops that the NUS carried out before they rolled the workshops out over several universities – after it was decided as a positive step and thus launched nationwide!

Matt Clarke:

I collected a survey 2 months after the workshops in 2017 – 32 out of 36 were strongly positive.

Ro Green:

You said that they may be effective in short term, but not having any long-term effect. I know for a fact that one of the key parts of the racial and LGBTQ workshops is exposure, therefore reducing prejudice in the long-term.

James Brown:

With regards to the Harvard Business Review study, the only reason there is an adverse effect is because people are scared that they are likely to get sued for misrepresentation, which is clearly not a valid concern in our college environment. And also the workshops in the Harvard study were absolutely mandatory, and there is naturally backlash against anything that is mandatory.

Samuel Dicks:

Our workshops are marked as mandatory.

Naomi Hirst:

The workshops might be marked as mandatory, but you are told you can leave at any stage and for any reason at the beginning.

Samuel Dicks:

So why are the workshops marked as mandatory?

Ben Peacock:

Quoting NUS FAQs: a cultural shift will happen much slower if such workshops are not made mandatory.

Points of debate

Anonymous statement has been made, read out by the Independent Chair:

"This statement has no citations or quotations - worse than one of my first year essays - despite having clearly been mulled over for months. Please name your studies and their sources.

Aside from this, I have some questions about this motion's goals and how it is going about achieving them.

Who does this motion serve?

Does it serve minorities? Does it serve people like me, who have suffered sexual assault?

Why does your own anecdotal evidence about feeling uncomfortable after these workshops count as evidence, but not the anecdotal evidence and concerns of minorities who have benefitted from it?

How hard have you tried to do something positive?

Did you go to the freshers workshops in 2017, which were clearly advertised? Did you go to the SU training sessions for these workshops, which were clearly advertised?

This motion could be an excellent opportunity to call for good studies about workshops, but don't be fooled. We can friendly amend, or we can propose a separate motion to tell the SU that we think it'd be great to have some good statistics, if that is what the JCR desires. The spirit of the motion, as I understand it, is to get rid of these workshops. These are workshops which passionately want to stop hurt being caused. These are workshops which promote understanding and passionately want to protect minorities. These are workshops that participants are free to leave at any time without questions, and you're not exactly hunted down if you don't turn up.

I'm saddened that anyone has negative feelings towards these workshops, I wish they didn't, and I want that to change. But discomfort and disenfranchisement is not tackled by taking

lifelines away from those in danger. It comes from better dialogue and understanding - things which, in my experience, is always part of the running and training of workshops. People like me get hurt all the time as it is, please don't make it any harder."

Hannah Taylor:

These workshops are great. On a personal level, having lived my entire life up in the North and having had little/no contact with ethnic minorities, I am so grateful that those workshops existed, or I would have been ostracised for saying something completely out-of-line but completely by accident. I also wouldn't have known the language to use to be able to withdraw consent. These workshops are so good – above all they are empowering. They are useful because they make sure that people can be part of the 'group' and make people aware so that they are less likely to slip up and be socially ostracised as a result.

Ben Peacock:

It's also about creating certain environments and feelings in the JCR. When someone is an ethnic minority / LGBTQ / a survivor of sexual assault, for example, we need to show them that we are offering them protection. You need to be shown that protection in an obvious way, and those workshops do this really well.

Samuel Dicks:

I resent the idea that I am trying to take away support from people. I have not seen evidence of proper analysis to reduce the risks associated with these workshops. I would like to friendly amend the motion to withdraw clauses 1 and 3 of 'the JCR resolves'.

Harrison Engler:

Who would appoint an ethics board?

Samuel Dicks:

Ethics experts, which are already in place.

Ro Green:

When you say 'there are lots of dangers' – I don't understand what you mean, aside from making people feel anxious. But people are always warned beforehand with adequate trigger warnings and are told that they are always able to walk out for whatever reason. I don't see what your issue with the workshops is?

Samuel Dicks:

A lot of my concern arises from the wording that is used in the workshops, which is why it calls for an independent ethical review. One example is the phrase "Remember, it is not your intent that matters, it is the impact" which I pulled from the LGBTQ presentation. This is dangerous to tell someone that their intention doesn't matter, but the consequence of their actions do.

Ro Green:

What you are saying is a misrepresentation, and has been taken out of context. In context, they are saying that it doesn't matter whether you intend the person to be hurt or not (i.e. they will be hurt as an impact of your actions, even if you didn't intend it).

Tom Barrett:

I personally received a bit of backlash for being controversial in those workshops. But the key is not to focus on those who are ostracised for being controversial... the key is to focus on the message of support that these workshops are providing for potentially vulnerable people.

Samuel Dicks:

Admittedly, there is evidence that the sexual consent workshops are effective. But my point is that it is already a very volatile environment amongst Freshers, and therefore there is a great risk that these workshops do not have the intended impact – it calls for an ethical review.

Motion FAILS

Motion D – LMH Foundation Year Motion

THE JCR NOTES

1. University of Oxford targets 2017-20 focus on increasing the number for students “from schools and colleges that historically have had limited progression to Oxford”, “from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds” and “from neighbourhoods with low participation in higher education”.
2. Also commits to “supporting them at Oxford”.
3. Students at Oxford 1.4 times more likely to achieve firsts if they weren’t flagged at application; students who are not flagged also less likely to suspend or drop out.
4. Students are flagged if they apply from schools with low Oxbridge admission rates, postcodes that are socioeconomically deprived or currently live or have lived in care.
5. It is thought that these differential outcomes are underpinned by the differing levels of human capital upon arrival at university, and different experiences in school.
6. As noted many times before, students from deprived backgrounds are underrepresented in progression to higher education and Oxbridge especially—for example, independent school pupils are 55 times more likely than free school meal pupils to obtain a place at Oxbridge.
7. A driving factor in this is the grade disparity at GCSE and A-level; independent school pupils are three and a half times more likely than FSM pupils to attain five GCSEs with grades A*-C including English and maths.
8. LMH as of 2016 has introduced a foundation year unique to college; students from disadvantaged backgrounds have three grade offer reduction for admission onto foundation year.
9. A range of subjects are offered by this foundation year, and over the course of the year both subject specific and general study skills are worked on in a curriculum centred around the individual.
10. Students are assessed for eligibility for the course on the basis of postcode, school, household income, parental education, and parental occupation; this is a more holistic system than applied for flagging at application generally.
11. Students are assessed throughout the year rather than by way of one final exam.

12. Often, students who access the foundation year come from social networks where there are no other people with experience of Oxbridge; they can act as ambassadors and help with other outreach efforts.
13. While the programme is in its infancy, all students from the first intake got the grades to progress and most chose to start an undergraduate degree; these students are performing on par with peers who entered directly into first year.

THE JCR BELIEVES

1. Work done by LMH has done well to address both access barriers and disadvantage when completing degree.
2. This work is worthy of note and recognition.
3. Foundation year goes above and beyond current access attempts, both in terms of assessment of disadvantage and intervention to address this.
4. The foundation year has a huge amount of potential to have knock-on effects in the disadvantaged communities that students come from, as they act as role models or ambassadors for progression to both Oxbridge and higher education in general. Further, it makes Oxbridge seem an attainable goal

THE JCR RESOLVES

1. To pass a motion of endorsement of the LMH foundation year.
2. To mandate the access officer to speak to the college in order to communicate this stance and open a conversation on this topic.

Proposer: Emma Jackson

Seconder: Hugh Watmough

Short Factual Points

Harrison Engler:

Is there evidence that it is more successful per pound spent in comparison with other access schemes?

Emma Jackson:

At the moment, it is expensive per student. But at the same time, it is one of the only schemes that does address the academic disparity, and is intended to target the most disadvantaged students. It's the only kind of intensive outreach that works.

Jessy:

It IS more effective [quotes statistics from the study].

Points for debate

Ben Peacock:

This scheme has had a massive impact. It's really important that they focus on those that are the most difficult to engage. For example, only 1% in care go onto higher education, let alone Oxford. This is an expensive scheme, but it is helping those who are the most difficult to engage, without which they are unlikely to get in or even apply.

Emma Jackson:

It's also great because of its knock-on effects; they will go back and talk about their experience at Oxbridge, giving a great ripple effect in the local community. This statement of support would create an environment in which these schemes could flourish.

PASSES

Motion E - Maple Syrup Motion

THE JCR NOTES

1. That the waffle is a staple of the famous and much-anticipated Hugh's brunch.
2. That maple syrup is a typical popular waffle topping.
3. That until Trinity term 2018, maple flavoured sauce was served alongside chocolate flavoured sauce and toffee fudge flavoured sauce as an option for waffle topping in hall.

THE JCR BELIEVES

1. That the reintroduction of maple syrup would further increase the popularity of weekend brunch.
2. That the JCR would benefit from the increased happiness that would be provided by the reintroduction of maple syrup as a waffle topping at brunch.

THE JCR RESOLVES

1. To request the catering department to recommence offering maple syrup (or maple flavoured sauce, as funds and suppliers may allow) as a waffle topping at brunch.

Proposed by: Alice Worsley

Seconded by: Laura Bishop

PASSES

6. Statement motions for debate.

7. Items for discussion.

8. Any other business.

Travel Grants Meeting

1. *Oxford University Finnmark Expedition*
2. *Exploring Vietnam and Myanmar*
3. *Obstetrics and Gynaecology placement at Mahamodora Hospital, Sri Lanka*
4. *Teaching English and Hygiene in Guatemala to underprivileged children*
5. *4 Weeks of Language Courses in Prague to improve beginner's Czech*

6. *Internship at the Paleo-Primate Project (in Gorongosa National Park, Mozambique)*
7. *Cultural Trip to Barcelona to practise my Spanish*
8. *English Teaching in China*
9. *Walking the Medieval Pilgrimage Route to Santiago for 800km*
10. *HVP Volunteering Placement - teaching at a school in Kathmandu, Nepal*
11. *Backpacking trip around Portugal for 3 weeks*
12. *Diving Down Under*
13. *InsaNE PALadin - travelling throughout the world to make a real change!*
14. *Summer camp for Arabic in Jordan*
15. *Obstetrics and Gynaecology placement at Mahamodora Hospital, Sri Lanka*
16. *Cycling across Ukraine*
17. *JunHE (Beijing) Summer Internship*
18. *Tropical Forest Ecology in Borneo*

No applications vetoed.

Independent Chair Election

Curtis Crowley

Returning Officer Election

George Cherry

Travel Grants / IC election / RO election go to Online Vote

Travel Grants awarded to:

- (5) *4 Weeks of Language Courses in Prague to improve beginner's Czech - £200*
- (16) *Cycling across Ukraine - £200*
- (17) *JunHE (Beijing) Summer Internship - £135*
- (15) *Obstetrics and Gynaecology placement at Mahamodora Hospital, Sri Lanka - £200*
- (4) *Teaching English and Hygiene in Guatemala to underprivileged children - £200*
- (6) *Internship at the Paleo-Primate Project (in Gorongosa National Park, Mozambique) - £200*
- (13) *InsaNE PALadin - travelling throughout the world to make a real change! - £200*
- (14) *Summer camp for Arabic in Jordan - £200*
- (18) *Tropical Forest Ecology in Borneo - £200*
- (12) *Diving Down Under - £150*
- (2) *Exploring Vietnam and Myanmar - £115*