

TREVELYAN COLLEGE JCR MINUTES

# JCR Meeting

3rd December 2017 6:30pm

---

## CONTENTS

---

Contents	1
Absent	1
Exec Reports	2
Formal dinner priority and discipline motion	2
Sports and Societies attendance at JCR meetings motion	3

**Votes** are in red throughout the text and are listed at the end.

*Italics are mine*

---

## ABSENT

---

---

## EXEC REPORTS

---

### PRESIDENT

Lydia Edwards: Catering trial starts next week, make sure you have your campus cards. I've been speaking to university and PresComm etc. about the events of last week.

---

### FORMAL DINNER PRIORITY AND DISCIPLINE MOTION

---

Danny Nowak: The aim of this motion is to increase the transparency of the formal procedure. I don't think the system is that consistent. Sometimes you get on with a group, sometimes you don't, there isn't an explanation of how this works. Secondly, second years have been lower priority previously and really, that's because they've been treated as a group rather than individually. What a Trevs formal is about is everyone coming together and if you're just going to be excluded based on year group it promotes less diversity. Everyone should have the right to be on formal. That's up to the JCR or college officers who are involved. I just want to get started a discussion about the priority system and how it can be fairer and then the Exec can go away and get it sorted.

Emma Maynard: Why isn't this two separate motions?

Danny Nowak: Both are about getting into formal.

Ben Bauman: What is section 10 of the standing orders?

Mike Dermody: It pertains to formals.

Daisie Langford: If we pass this motion, what actually happens?

Danny: We had a discussion at the last JCR meeting about the second years being lower priority for formal. This had no conclusion whatsoever, so ideally the Exec might go away and review the standing orders.

*Mike reads the resolutions of the motion*

Daisie: So if we pass this motion we agree to review the priorities but don't actually say how it should be?

Danny: Yes, I don't believe it's my position to say what the priority ought to be.

Daisie: The section on 'this JCR notes' does have some specific issues noted though.

Nat Kunin: Just to clarify how this thing works- on the whole the priority is done to give each year group the share of priority over the term. The decision to exclude second years was made at a College level.

Emma Maynard: At the last meeting we did cover all bases and it came down to a College Officer decision. Lydia also did what she could and negotiated down. I don't think as an exec we could have done any more.

Lydia Edwards: We shouldn't publicly disclose people who have been disciplined by college. That's not good for rehabilitating them into the college community.

Danny: What I'm saying is that if someone does something wrong at formal then they should be told individually, I'm not saying it should be public.

Lydia Edwards: We already have the debtors list so I just don't see what we can do.

Danny Nowak: Okay well I'm happy to remove that point.

*Amendment to remove the stipulation that people are told why they haven't got into formal proposed by Danny, seconded by Lydia and accepted.*

Abi Johnson: On picking and choosing who's required in formal. As far as I understand, the system does try and make it as fair as it can.

Nat: The system automatically orders the groups in first come first served.

Danny: But that's not clear that if you apply earlier you're more likely to get in. That's what I would like to fix.

Ben Bauman: What system should we have if not first come first served?

Abi: I don't think this is a clear enough motion. Perhaps we could just ask Nat to write an email explaining how the system works currently.

Mike: Nat, is there a process you currently follow for setting priority?

Nat: There are precedents for certain formals like Trevs Day but otherwise it's organised to keep it as fair as possible.

Manon: On the subject of being transparent, and if it's going to be first come first served, can we make it so the email comes out at a standard time.

Nat: Surely having it random is being fair...

?: Perhaps just sending an email saying applications will open at a certain time tomorrow would be good.

Danny: That's a really good idea.

*Further amendments to the motion*

Mike: So the motion now mandates some form of JCR body, perhaps JCR committee, to consult about the priority system that exists and come back with a more codified system.

**Vote passes overwhelmingly**

---

## SPORTS AND SOCIETIES ATTENDANCE AT JCR MEETINGS MOTION

---

Lydia Edwards: There is currently no formal medium for sports societies to keep in touch with what's going on in college. This mandates any society or sport with less than 10 people to send one to every JCR meeting.

Darcy Van Eerten: Volleyball is pretty small but by this we would still have to send two people.

Lydia: We can change the number.

Page Yates: Does it really matter how many people you have? Surely one person could do it?

Emma Maynard: Some societies do have a cross section of people over many years so it might be useful.

Page: Maybe the society could discuss that.

Tom: So this covers every society?

Lydia: Yes, every ratified society. JCR Meetings have budget reviews and lots of other things that really affect societies.

Darcy: Does it have to be one person per society or can one person represent multiple?

Lydia: What does the JCR want? I would say one person can represent a multitude.

Luke Tracey: Does the rep have to sign in?

Emma Maynard: They have that in Cuths.

Ollie: Can they abstain?

Lydia: Yes they can send apologies.

?: Can you send apologies all year? Basketball, for instance, doesn't necessarily have that much to do with what goes on in JCR meetings.

Abi: It goes back to what Prof. was saying earlier about trying to integrate societies into the JCR. All societies use JCR money. I can't see that being a negative thing.

Sam Sandham: In terms of mandating that, there are some societies where that might not be relevant. And Mike does send the agenda out before the meeting. Should we not get the people representing the clubs to read the agenda and, if anything comes up, they could speak to the sports rep.

Alex Durk: All your doing is mandating someone on each exec committee to send apologies twice a term.

Daisie: The idea is that they might not realise a motion affects them.

George: If you actually participate in discussion than the society may become more relevant.

Angus: I just don't see the point, any individual can choose to come along and raise issues if they need to.

Lydia: It's just a shame when teams don't turn up to the budget and then complain that we're not being transparent.

?: Surely if they're choosing not to turn up to meetings then it's because there is no issue that concerns them at the time. It shouldn't be mandated upon them if they feel they don't have grievances to raise.

Daisie: It's just adding an extra email reminder like the tier 2s.

Lydia: It's just that if something comes up within the meeting, how is the society accountable? Transparency goes two ways. It helps open up a dialogue and helps everyone get more from the JCR.

Andrea: Is this an effective way of increasing participation? Couldn't we try to enforce this in a different way. When you make something obligatory, it is connected with "oh fuck I have to turn up". It doesn't get the mood of participation that is needed, there needs to be a good productive passion. I don't know if this is the effective way.

?: Instead of enforcing it at every JCR meeting, make it the important ones?

Lydia: Things can come up in discussion or any other business that isn't planned.

Tom: Why not make it more like an invitation?

Abi: Most of our meetings in Steering Comm last year were discussing ways of getting people to JCR meetings. The problem is, we still have meetings where we have literally minimum people to run a meeting with. I don't know about you guys but I'm getting spammed on email and Facebook, people know that JCR meetings are on.

?: I think it's useful to send someone as society representative as they may then have different concerns.

Ben Bauman: Who would the email be sent to?

Mike: It would be sent to the president/most executive member; we have a mailing list of these people.

Emma: I remember being in the office and seeing how many subs are put down by all the societies and I think it would be really good to see how decisions are made to do with money.

**Vote against the motion, less than 2/3 in favour**

---

## VOTES

---

Formal dinner priority and discipline motion **passed**

Sports and Societies attendance at JCR meetings motion