



---

## GYM MATTING MOTION

---

*speech from the college bursar, Martin Clement*

**Vote overwhelmingly in favour of the gym matting motion**

---

## EXEC REPORTS

---

Mike: Nominations for chair, president, treasurer and welfare officer open today.

---

## TIER 1 & 2 MEETING MOTION

---

Lydia E: Last year, around February, it was passed that tier 1s and 2s should meet twice a term. We trialed this in third term and we actually don't have that much to speak about. It doesn't really work so it's a bit pointless. It's also very difficult to get everyone in the same room at the same time twice a term. This motion proposes that it goes back to once a term and the structure of the meeting should be decided by the tier 1s and 2s at the time- something like becoming a drop-in meeting as that might be more beneficial.

Dom Gommo: Who's in the meeting?

Mike: All the elected tier 1s and 2s.

Abi Johnson: Is it not worth seeing if anyone has anything to say this term, let it run a little longer as last term we had all only just been elected.

Lydia E: We were going to have a second meeting before summer ball and literally no one brought any agenda points to me.

Manon Post: We're just questioning whether these meetings need to happen so often, it's not like tier 2s can't see tier 1s directly.

Page Yates: On the structure of the meeting, I thought it was very useful to have everyone in the room.

Emma Maynard: The tier 1s do still meet regularly with their relevant tier 2s. It's more beneficial for all the roles to fill their targets if people can go and sort out urgent issues as they arise. If a gym rep is at a meeting and all that comes up relates to the social chair, there's no point them being there.

Daisie Langford: It's just about not wasting everyone's time.

Jennie Steele: What problem was the original motion trying to solve?

Daisie Langford: The idea was to make tier 2s more active but I think other measures have worked in this regard. Tier 2s do seem to have been more active this year.

Sam: But what was this trying to fix in the first place?

Daisie: It wasn't necessarily trying to fix a problem just to make the tier 2s more engaged.

## **Vote overwhelmingly in favour of making the tier 1 and 2 meeting once a term**

---

### **MITIE PLC MOTION**

---

Daisie Langford: Durham University have a contract with this company Mitie which is generally known for human rights violations. Many JCRs have passed a motion like this to campaign against the University keeping this contract. Durham is going to divest from fossil fuels thanks in a large part to the student voice over the past few years.

Mike: The motion asks the JCR to lobby the uni to not renew their contract with Mitie plc.

Sam Sandham: What can we do?

Darcy Van Eerten: If lots of common rooms pass a motion like this then it will go to assembly and if it passes assembly then the SU will have to fight for it. Anyone can write a motion for assembly by the way. So, we've done something similar for fossil fuels. Are we going to keep doing this for different areas of investment in the University? I'm just concerned that this might become a pattern. I feel like we should either go through the whole list of their investments or...

Daisie Langford: It's not just about this issue, it's about unethical contracts in general. This is a specific example. I don't think it's necessarily the case.

?: We are doing this alongside many other universities so it has more clout.

Mike: So this would also ask the university to oppose other unethical companies.

Ben Bauman: Is there an alternative?

Daisie Langford: The idea would be to not renew the contract and instead look at the alternative bidders.

?: I understand the premise of the motion because obviously you've identified specific instances where they haven't treated people well. There is just one line I'm concerned with, where you talk about immigration detention. Why is that specifically put in? A lot of security firms are also going to be involved in that kind of thing. It seems like too much of a broad brush. I would propose an amendment to say that the motion should read "unethical immigration detention".

*Amendment seconded by Daisie Langford and accepted*

**Vote overwhelmingly in favour of the motion to take a stance against the university's contract with Mitie plc.**

---

## ANY OTHER BUSINESS

---

### NON-FINALISTS BEING BANNED FROM FORMAL

Josh Preston: Why should non-finalists be banned from formal. It wasn't uniquely our fault.

Lydia E: I had a meeting with Prof. about this the following day and this was an alternative to a blanket ban on the next two formals.

Daisie Langford: It wasn't just the specific actions of specific people it was overall the worst formal I've been to in Durham.

Mike: To play devil's advocate... If it's difficult to say who's responsible how are certain people being held responsible?

Emma Maynard: The general noise-level was awful. I had to get up 7 times and the last formal I got up once. I hope you understand there are people being dealt with by college. At the end of the day, it's up to Prof. to decide whether we get invited to formal. When I was a second year I didn't go to many, non-finalists tend to be low down on the priority list anyway.

Ryan: It's fair to say we can't pinpoint who was responsible but we can know who definitely were not. Can we stop the ban from extending to people who weren't present?

Daisie Langford: I don't think we could do that without Nat spending a long time on the seating plan.

Lydia E: Also, **non-finalists are not banned**, they're just lowest priority.

Emma Maynard: The JCR exec are not actually bouncers. When it's the majority of people who act like that and Lydia has managed a compromise I think we need to appreciate that.

Manon: I understand everything that has been said, non-finalists did have priority but there are also finalists doing that.

Daisie Langford: We've had other formals that finalists have been at and those problems weren't there. Returners formal has always been more lively but, if it really weren't anything to do with the year group we would have had this before.

Alex Grover: It is usual for non-finalists to not have priority.

Dom Gommo: I have two points. First one is, does formal discipline come through college?

Lydia E: It depends. College leave it up to us for minor things but it gets to a point.

Dom Gommo: Would it be worth advertising the discipline side of it more? I think a lot of people see it as an opportunity to test it.

Mike: As a point of info, everyone does tick the box agreeing to the joint formal agreement when they sign up.

Emma Maynard: When you attend one and you pay money and you get dressed up, you should know the rules. I have sent several emails over the past few weeks re-iterating the rules.

Mary Karvalits: I just want to point out that Emma was really strong making people aware. I just think the way this formal played out kind of shows the sort of culture that is not something the JCR should be promoting.

Lydia E: Non-finalists were not first or second priority for the rest of term last year anyway.

Mike: So it's not really a punishment?

Lydia E: Yeah.

Daisie: The reason Prof. is reacting so strongly is because Anne Allen was there and other guests. I think Prof. was mortified that we invited guests to a formal dinner that descended into chaos.

Emma Maynard: Especially the people who walked out, it's so rude.

James Lowrey: If every offender has had these disciplinary meetings, why has college added the ban?

Emma Maynard: Because it was the general noise level, the number of times I had to get up and bear in mind that fines are a last resort.

Lydia E: I think college also wanted to set a precedent. The whole thing is about community, if one group is ruining someone's formal then it's not really a community.

Mary: It's not just the fact that many people were loud and rowdy but that the rest of their group didn't address that. It's pointless to have the exec, 10 people, in the room trying to discipline 170.

Emma Maynard: We don't want to have to get bouncers for formals.

Josh Preston: So, to confirm, we were bottom priority all along?

Mike: Have we conflated non-finalists with second years? There are a number of non-finalists in third year too.

Lydia E: You can still join committees that get guaranteed seats. You can still get in with people in other years.

Ben Bauman: Do we need to look at the weighting of formals throughout the year? Maybe this should be reviewed across the terms.

?: Ban alcohol?

*general disagreement, audible boos*

Lydia Kingston: It's more of a culture thing. LGBT+ formal is not just an opportunity to have a piss up, there's more to it than that.

---

## VOTES

---

### **GYM MATTING MOTION**

- passed overwhelmingly, the JCR will reimburse college for the cost of the gym matting

### **TIER 1 AND 2 MOTION**

- passed overwhelmingly, the tier 1s and 2s will now meet once a term

### **MITIE PLC MOTION**

- passed overwhelmingly, the JCR will take a stance against the university's contract with Mitie plc.