JCR Meeting  
to be held on 12th June 2016 at 6.30pm in the Bar

Agenda

1. **Meeting Called to Order**

18:44

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Minutes of the Last Meeting**

ALL PASSED

1. **Chair and Exec Reports and Questions**

Sam Leather: catching up post exams, Trevs day and summer ball. Reinstated seconds in the dining hall. Freshers week also on horizon.

Hannah Fisher: Message JCR Facebook page with suggestions

1. **Discussion Points**

* End of session formal is ticketed

Lydia Edwards will provide pretty tickets.

Guy Harland: how many people on the door? Need to know about angry people and timing

Lily Walwyn: will just use our judgment as to whether to let them in if past 7pm.

Daisie Langford: we will have a system and will be as smooth as possible

* Don’t forget to vote in the EU referendum

Tom Grant: Encouraged everyone to vote. Tom Grant provided a few links to independent links for fact checking for people to research regarding the referendum.

* Shared rooms

Sam Leather: From college officers – about 20 shared rooms in college – most (bar 5) are able to be chopped in two and make in to two single rooms – but one wouldn’t have washing facilities. Thoughts?

Bridget Shepherd: would lack of washing facilities be cheaper?

Ben Bauman: Affect changeover process?

Lily Walwyn: Room changing thing is annoying but actually really nice, helps you to get to know more people and facilitates the friendly, know-everyone atmosphere which is valuable to Trevs.

Charlie Norton: Sinks on corridors and things are not sufficient for people without sinks in rooms

Aman Gupta: Really nice to share a room

Emma Maynard: Shared rooms tend to be the social hub and fosters a lot of communal friendships. Other college residents jealous of shared rooms

Toby Johnson: Overall a good sharing system and well received by everyone

Adam Jarvis: Where would this fall as the scheme of works? Should be below refurbing blocks if it happens.

Sam Leather: General consensus is NO

* Student Experience

Daisie Langford: College have underspent their budget for student experience – any suggestions or thoughts then let Daisie Langford know?

Emily Vass: Examples of previous expenditure?

Daisie Langford: At the moment instruments for general use, not on sports as so much money is currently going to the new gym. Cannot be for music.

Guy Harland: Pinball machine?

Charlie Norton: Food vending machines?

Daisie Langford: Will look into it, anymore suggestions speak to Daisie Langford

1. **Motions**
   * Censure motion

Sam Leather: Current system is unusable, a revision had to be made up and been approved by college council. Motion of censure can be brought against any elected position member of the JCR in writing. Signed by 20 members of the JCR. Considered by the panel.

This panel will decide on a course of action – upheld complaint or discarded. If upheld – speak to person (1st warning), no improvement / another complain – letter 20 signatures, letter of defence if they want to, considered by panel, required to resign by the chair / VP if chair in question. Same with president – someone else from exec will be on panel. If not in favour then continue as normal

Bridget Shepherd: Previous system – also an automatic motion of censure – if chair knew there was an issue – does the chair still have the right to set this running.

Emily Vass: yes, the chair could start it running

Adam Jarvis: no automatic motion of censure?

Tom Grant: no

Adam Jarvis: what’s rest of sentence for 6a and 13a?

Emily Vass and Tom Grant clarified.

Christina Feeney: Explicit if a person isn’t fulfilling their job description – what about their behaviour or conduct is unacceptable but still fulfilling job description what would be the process?

Emma Maynard: Conduct unbefitting clause could be added?

Guy Harland: Unacceptable behaviour?

Christina Feeney added an amendment

Bridget Shepherd: no2. OR detailing where they have brought the JCR in to disrepute b their conduct and providing evidence

Christina Feeney: OR 1. OR Has behaved in an unacceptable manner.

Guy Harland: JCR into disrepute covers more tings

Tom Grant: Amendment on clause 1 OR HAS ACTED IN A WAY THAT HAS BROUGHT THE JCR INTO DISREPUTE and 2

Bridget Shepherd seconded, Sam Leather accepted.

Lily Walwyn: questioned the clarity of that – member of exec behaved inappropriately towards a member of the JCR – they wouldn’t necessarily know about it? Isn’t clear enough what inappropriate behaviour is?

Emily Vass: Panel though

Lily Walwyn: Yes but for applications – person to person?

Guy Harland: but point is that they are not fulfilling job description / starting fight in town

Tom Grant: PUBLICITY ?

Lily Walwyn: Might not be able to interpret it properly

Christina Feeney: Could something go above it to explain what it can be used for not in standing order talk

Tom Grant: An easy guide to the JCR will be worked on over the summer from legalese / political speech to normal speak. This would obviously be a part of it.

Lily Walwyn: If on JCR website then yes sufficient?

Tom Grant: Yes?

Emily Vass: **ACTION POINT that an explanatory document will be on website and completed over summer if not for whole JCR then just censure.**

Toby Johnson: definition of censure?

Tom Grant: formally complain, and / or remove them from office

Toby Johnson: Being a bully? If in responsibility an even worse thing

Adam Jarvis: If you have a problem of bullying – welfare / Latham. If abuse of power by elected position then that’s separate motion of censure. Latham ld know what to do with a motion of censure, would be able to direct and help direct people to it.

Guy Harland: 4. Why SCR member? Happy for them to be there that there is no bias etc but seeding power over a JCR matter isn’t sensible since we have no control over them – accountability and democracy – why is an SCR member able to vote on this issue for us? Change to voting rights rebuked / observations?

Sam Leather: In interests of fair procedure and no conflicts of interest – that’s why they were there.

Guy Harland: Could we keep them but as an observer so they can comment but then they won’t vote as them voting is unfair

Guy Harland: \*blank\* AS A NON VOTING OBSERVER

Seconded by Emily Vass

Sam Leather wanted a vote

FOR: overwhelming

NO: a few

Ben Bauman: Anything to stop repetitive action against a person?

Emily Vass that’s why there is 20 signatories

Lily Walwyn: if panel think it’s unfair then they can throw it out

Guy Harland: If rubbish feedback and not happy with result then can censure again

Adam Jarvis: Rejected and then reapplied – treated as a new complaint – can that be clarified?

Emily Vass: New complaint different or just a re thing?

Adam Jarvis proposed an amendment to clarify that if the first complaint is rejected, and subsequent complaints will be treated as a first complaint.

Ben Bauman seconded.

Sam Leather: accepted it

Christina Feeney: 3 stage proves – agree with 2nd chance – what happens if the issue is recurring? If it has to go through multiple stages then does this prevent action from happening?

Bridget Shepherd: uni regulations would intervene if a serious issue with some positions

Daisie Langford: If anyone did anything serious to not have a second chance – not internal JCR discipline – college officers – could make a complaint still

Christina Feeney: but college officers don’t have any control over JCR

Jono Tiffany: make you step down voluntarily

Emily Vass: 2 step process. Could come up with an action plan in first round which could include resignation

Aman Gupta: 20 people – agree with extra people to check over it but what happens if not more than 20 people can know about an issue? Assuming a public fault.

Adam Jarvis: There are very, very few situations in college where less than 20 people would know about it. If it’s that bad then can be taken to other measures

Guy Harland: 20 is a good limit

Charlie Norton: If a person isn’t failing to fulfil their job description but in an unprofessional manner – should it be clarified in the motion?

Tom Grant: disrepute clause added

Charlie Norton: Suggests external disrepute, not exec member to exec member

Sam Leather: Even if internal putting position in to disrepute and therefore JCR in disrepute.

Bridget Shepherd: realistically people will read laymans version

Guy Harland: Disrepute – deliberately vague that covers almost anything

Ben Bauman: failing to fulfil their job description and reasons – suspended for the time they are being investigated?

Guy Harland: Continued censure motion – therefore no position. ASAP = 2/3 days. Could just resubmit motions even if request was not true then could still happen

Christina Feeney: G and steering job descriptions on website need updating because otherwise everyone needs censured as positions have been changed over years

Daisie Langford: can still be doing some jobs properly therefore more disruption

FOR: overwhelming

AGAINST: 0

Abstentions: 2

THIS MOTION HAS PASSED.

* + Assistant music rep

Aman Gupta: summarised the motion. Passed through preforming and arts committee, approved by past and existing music rep. Music tuition will greatly expand music rep therefore will expand role so this is needed

Adam Jarvis: MASH Room technician?

Aman Gupta: no one has run for the position and not that technical – most of the jobs include clearing up and tidying up

Adam Jarvis: does this dissolve mash room technician?

James Rockliffe: him and Jon discussed – make sure it ticks over until someone runs?

Jono Tiffany: what does standard music rep do? How do they fit together? Unplugged, Trevs stock..?

Aman Gupta: 50th anniversary stuff too

Theo Hurford: loads of new ideas to develop Trevs music – instrument teaching scheme – beneficial to have an assistant

Toby Johnson: Cinema room – one in JKH suite? Not being used?

Aman Gupta: Currently being used as storage, currently a gap

Alex Durk: called a cinema room in college therefore that’s what it is

Aman Gupta: essentially Dowrick storage 3

Daisie Langford: Cinema room isn’t a music storage room – it’s mixed – do we want AMR to be overseeing non music stuff?

Aman Gupta: there are music books, a double bass and lots of sheet music. 2 sofas, Trevs letters, headsets and things keep getting chucked in there – no one is looking after it

Adam Jarvis: don’t specify, needs to be more general “organisation of musical storage”?  
Adam Jarvis proposed an amendment to change to ALL MUSIC STORAGE AND FACILITIES and not rooms

Seconded by Christina Feeney

Aman Gupta: accepted

Lily Walwyn: When would this come into effect? Next term or next year?

Tom Grant: with committees? First Monday of term – earliest possible opportunity.

Jono Tiffany: How possible to make this an extension of music reps role?

Alex McKenzie: Fair point, but only reason that Alex McKenzie and TH have proposed this is that there is a lack of time to do things properly – music rep doesn’t always have time to look after things properly ad lack of time is causing opportunities to miss out on opportunities?

Hal Lockwood: can we clarify the teaching program? A dream that will not materialised – difficulties of finding teachers and times? Surely they could go directly to them? Want to take it on themselves?

Guy Harland: Going back to Jono Tiffany’s comment – music committee – is it too hard to say that music rep delegates to members of music committee?

IN FAVOUR: 27

AGAINST: 18

ABSTENTIONS: 5

MOTION HAS PASSED.

* + Colours word length

Adam Jarvis: summarised the motion.

Darcy van Eerten: does every app have to have a summary or all those accepted?

Adam Jarvis: All applications

Toby Johnson: only judged on page and summary – should it not be both?

Adam Jarvis: meant to be a summary – then people can’t add more stuff in

Guy Harland: Disagree with concept that we can’t sit in formal and listen to a speech – a sign of respect and appreciate someone who’s put time and effort into college. To shrink it down is to lose valuable details – belittling of process.

Adam Jarvis: I agree – like them all in full. But speaking to people is that people get bored of listening to them so that word length and summary is taken separately.

Guy Harland: What’s the point of summary if the full thing is going to be read out in formal?

MOTION TAKEN BY PARTS – changing limit, then summary.

Emily Vass: You can’t hear them – maybe people would be more respectful and actually listen to them if we could hear them.

Tom Grant: POI college owns microphones and speakers

Jono Tiffany: page limit / word limit change

Adam Jarvis: word limit is much more hard – it’s been ignored therefore should change

Guy Harland: Mics = good idea. People not listening = crowd control matter.

Bridget Shepherd: A4 template

Lily Walwyn: Easier to police a page than a length? Disciplined effectively is key

Enacting page limit:

IN FAVOUR: overwhelming

AGAINST: 2

ABSTENTIONS: 1

Submitting summary

IN FAVOUR: 0

AGAINST: overwhelming

ABSTENTION: 8

* + Standing orders update

Adam Jarvis: Summarised the motion – what happens in JCR meetings should actually happen.

**Tom Grant TO UPDATE STANDING ORDERS**

Lydia Edwards POI – all Exec were asked to check Tier 2s and Tier 3s as well as Tier 1s for what job descriptions are

Guy Harland: A readable google document that no one can change apart from select people – steering Comm actually writing it as its changing in the meeting

Bridget Shepherd: Keeping this within a week is a good idea

Alex Durk: Don’t bother discussing now, wait until next year

Aman Gupta: live update thing is quite important

Amendment by to change A MEMBER TO STEERING COMMITTEE – proposed Guy Harland, Lily Walwyn.

Adam Jarvis: accepted.

GENERAL AYE.

1. **Adjournment**

19:50

Prepared by,

**Tom Grant**Thomas.grant@durham.ac.uk

Censure Process Motion

# Summary

The current censure process is unusable. The purpose of this motion is to replace the old system with a new system in order to increase accountability of elected members to the JCR

# This JCR notes

* The current censure process is out of date and cannot be used
* This new system has been approved by College Council

# This JCR believes

* A process of censure is required to improve accountability of all elected and appointed members to the JCR

# This JCR resolves

* Replace the current censure system with the attached process

Proposed by: Sam Leather  
Seconded by: Alex McKenzie

**Appendix**

1. A motion of censure shall be brought against any elected or appointed position holder in the JCR when an individual has not adequately fulfilled their job description as listed in the Job Descriptions on the JCR website, or when they have contravened the Standing Orders as listed on the JCR website
2. A complaint in writing shall be submitted to the JCR Chair, explicitly listing the clauses in the job description or standing orders that have been contravened and providing evidence of this
   1. Where the complaint is made against the Chair, the complaint shall be submitted to the Vice President
3. The letter of complaint must be signed by 20 other members of the JCR
4. In the first instance of a complaint being made, a meeting shall be convened at the earliest possible opportunity between the president, vice president, chair, two members of steering committee and a member of the Senior Common Room Executive Committee.
   1. If the complaint is made against the president, vice president or chair then another member of the exec shall take their place on the panel
   2. All members of the panel must explicitly state any possible conflict of interest and the Chair will decide if they should still sit on the panel
   3. If an individual cannot sit on the panel because of a conflict of interest, then another individual shall take their place subject to declaration of conflict of interests
5. Where the panel decides to uphold the complaint, an action plan shall be drawn up for the individual to follow
   1. The complaint can only be upheld by a two thirds majority of the panel, excluding the chair or vice president
6. The panel may decide to dismiss the complaint in the first instance
   1. If the complaint is dismissed, then the panel shall submit a written explanation as to why to the original signatory
7. This action plan shall be publicly accessible upon request to the chair
   1. Where the action plan is regarding the chair, then the vice president shall hold the action plan
8. In the second instance of a complaint, the letter must also be signed by 20 members of the JCR
9. In the second instance, the chair shall pass on the letter of complaint and invite the individual to submit a written defence of their actions
   1. Where the complaint is made against the chair, the vice president shall invite the individual to submit a written defence of their actions
10. A panel consisting of the chair, president, vice president, two members of steering, two members of JCR Comm and a member of the Senior Common Room Executive Committee shall be convened
    1. Where the complaint is made against either the president, vice president or chair, another member of the exec shall take their place on the panel
    2. All members of the panel must explicitly state any possible conflict of interest and the Chair will decide if they should still sit on the panel
    3. If an individual cannot sit on the panel because of a conflict of interest, then another individual shall take their place subject to declaration of conflict of interests
11. This panel shall consider the complaint against the defence
12. If they find in favour of the complaint, the chair shall require that the individual resign at the earliest possible opportunity, and elections shall be opened
    1. The complaint can only be upheld by a two thirds majority of the panel, excluding the chair or vice president
    2. If the chair has to resign, then the vice president shall open elections for chair at the earliest possible opportunity
13. If the panel finds in favour of the individual, then they do not have to resign and may continue to carry out the duties of their office
    1. If the complaint is dismissed, then the panel shall submit a written explanation as to why to the original signatory

**Assistant Music Rep Motion**

# Summary

The creation of a formal position to help the Music Rep with the expansion of the role. Music Committee have discussed and approved new ideas for the music rep to oversee – such as starting an instrument teaching scheme. Moreover, the creation of this role would also be to fill certain roles in tech and clarify the boundaries between the responsibilities of tech and music.

# This JCR notes…

* That the role of the Music Rep is expanding.
* That the Music Committee has approved new endeavours, for which the Music Rep needs assistance, in addition to those outlined in the JCR Standing Orders
* That there is sufficient interested in starting an instrument teaching scheme.
* That tech comm has struggled to find a successor for the MASH Room technician; moreover, this role is not a tech specialist role.

# This JCR believes…

* That the role of the Music Rep is greatly expanding to the extent that the creation of this role would greatly benefit Trevs Music.
* There is a need to monitor the location of and borrowing of instruments owned by the JCR and College. In addition to this the organisation of storage cupboards is not currently in the remit of any JCR elected position. In the past this has simply been filled by keen members of college – who have no official responsibility or mandate.
* The MASH Room Technician is not a specifically tech related role and hence can be filled by an AMR.
* There is scope for an Instrument Teaching to be implemented, however, the Music Rep does not have the time to take this responsibility on alongside their current responsibilities.
* That an AMR would also help the Music Rep with their current duties, such as running unpluggeds, organising music for events.

# This JCR resolves…

* To create the Tier 3 position of Assistant Music Rep; who will also sit on Music and Performing Arts Committee.
* That the AMR will coordinate the new instrument teaching programme which the Music Committee has approved.
* That the AMR will provide assistance to the Music Rep in the general running of college music as noted in the JCR Notes.
* That the AMR will organise, tidy and catalogue all college and JCR owned musical instruments.
* That the AMR will monitor the renting of these instruments at any point they leave college premises.
* That the AMR will be overseeing use and organisation of Music 2, the MASH Room and the Cinema Room.
* That the AMR will report any technical issues in the MASH Room to the Tech Manager.

Proposed by: Aman Gupta

Seconded by: Theo Hurford

**Colours Word Length Motion**

**Summary:**

Having written colours nominations and having sat on both the Full and Half Colours panels, the word limits for these awards do not make sense to us. The word limit of 450 words has been ignored since its inception, with the 3 successful Half Colours awards at Handover this year being around 600 words and the last recipients of Full Colours were around 1000 words. This motion aims to change the limit to one side of A4 (to match the template used for the awards) and to reduce the size of the speeches used for Half Colours awards in formal.

**This JCR notes that:**

* The Half and Full Colours awards currently have a maximum word limit of 450 words.
* The nominations for the most recent recipients of Full Colours (June 2014) were in around 1000 words long.
* The nominations for the most recent recipients of Half Colours (March 2016) all exceeded this word limit.
* Unsuccessful Full Colours nominations automatically drop down to the Half Colours panel.
* Colours are awarded in formal by means of reading out the successful nominations.

**This JCR believes that:**

* The word limits for these nominations have been ignored completely since the word limit was created.
* A deserving candidate of Full Colours (or indeed Half Colours) cannot effectively be summed up in 450 words.
* Since unsuccessful Full Colours nominations are automatically taken to the Half Colours panel, the word limits for both should be the same.
* Reading out Half Colours nominations takes a very long time in formal.

**This JCR resolves to:**

* Change the word length requirements for both awards to “must fit into the A4 template provided by the JCR Chair with a font size no smaller than 10”.
* Require any nominations for Full Colours to include a “150-200 word summary of the application” which will be read out in formal if the application is unsuccessful for Full Colours but is subsequently successful for Half Colours. This summary will not be used to judge the applications and is merely used for the presentation of successful awards. If the application is successful for Full Colours, it shall be read out in full.
* Require any nominations for Half Colours to include a “150-200 word summary of the application” which will be read out in formal. This summary will not be used to judge the applications and is merely used for the presentation of successful awards.

**Proposed by:** Adam Jarvis

**Seconded by:** Bridget Shepherd

**Standing Orders Updates Motion**

**Summary:**

Motions which have been passed at JCR Meetings over the last few years have not always been reflected in the Governing Documents, and these changes have subsequently been lost. This motion aims to address this by requiring a member of Steering Committee to update the Governing Documents after each JCR Meeting to ensure changes are fairly represented, and to ensure the Chair distributes the most up-to-date version of these to the JCR prior to each meeting.

**This JCR notes that:**

* Some motions which have been submitted over the last 3 years which make changes to the Standing Orders (and other governing documents) have not been reflected in these documents.
* Motions are written based on the most available copy of the Governing Documents.

**This JCR believes that:**

* It is important to update these documents to reflect the changes passed by the JCR.
* If the documents are not updated immediately, changes that were proposed are likely to be forgotten.

**This JCR resolves to:**

* Add to the Job Description of the JCR Chair: “Nominate a member of Steering Committee who will be responsible for updating any changes to the JCR Governing Documents within a week of the JCR Meeting in which they were proposed”.
* Add to the Job Description of the JCR Chair: “Shall ensure the up-to-date JCR Governing Documents are available to all members of the JCR prior to the submission of motions for each JCR Meeting”.
* Add to the Job Description of Steering Committee: “Aid the Chair with the maintenance of the JCR Governing Documents”.

**Proposed by:** Adam Jarvis   
**Seconded by:** Bridget Shepherd