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**EXEC REPORTS**

**Tom**: Assembly was this Thursday, lots of motions were passed, one among them being that the new college could be named after Mo Mowlam, printing is now free for postgrads.

**Grover**: Trevstock is next week!!

**Robyn**: FinComm happened.

**Nat**: What was bought?

**Robyn**: Table tennis things!

**Jacob**: Election for Ball Chair opens tomorrow at 10am.

**MOTION: Operations Review**

**Tom**: Ops review will have a major effect on college life and college staff. This motion has already been rotated around some other colleges, basically it’s saying that we officially condemn the ops review and the President will email the JCR and the University officially stating this. He will then keep us updated over the status of things. The relevant officers within the JCR will look into ways to minimise the effect.

**Mary**: What does this motion do that we haven’t or are doing already?

**Tom**: We haven’t got an official stance on it. It lays the groundwork for future action.

**Mary**: The consultation period involved the University getting huge numbers of people who were against it. I see the point, and I do agree with the motion, but the consultation period is closed and I’m not sure what this will actually do considering that the changes are already happening. Asking the president to do something they’re already doing seems a little redundant.

**Tom**: There is still things to be done, the SU are looking into how contractually correct this is.

**Mary**: They’ve been doing that since March and we haven’t seen anything since. I don’t know what’s going to happen.

**Tom**: They haven’t moved on. The Vice-Chancellor said that he was going to consider the SU’s proposals.

**Mary**: Isn’t this technically already what you’re already doing?

**Ben**: In general motions of this kind force every individual of the JCR to have the same standpoint and should anybody disagree with the motion. If people have different opinions, they’re kind of drowned out. It was similar last year with the strikes, although the majority of people have the same opinion, I don’t know how fair it is.

**Tom**: Could you say that about anything passed?

**Ben**: It makes the JCR have a standpoint outside the body that it exists in?

**Tom**: I’m not sure how much outside us this really is. Most of the effects will be hardest felt within the JCR. This is a JCR matter.

**Nat**: Whether you like this type of motion or not, there is plenty of precedent for motions like this passing.

**Ben**: The standing orders say that the JCR cannot have a political stance.

**Nat**: I don’t think this is a political stance.

**Grover**: As an employee of the university, this kind of motion is a motion where much of the resolves isn’t actually achieving anything. Mandating all the other positions to find other ways to lobby for this – this could be difficult, because in three weeks people actually start getting made redundant. It’s all pretty much set in stone at this point. The majority of the changes are happening really soon. There’s very little that can actually be changed.

**Tom**: Your point is that we’re defeated and we shouldn’t even try?

**Grover**: You’re one JCR that’s fighting a massive university who’s been planning this for years. I don’t want to sound defeatist. Officially, they have done what they are required to do.

**Tom**: You say that we are one JCR but as I mentioned previously this has already been passed in many other JCRs.

**Grover**: I’d like to point out that the entirety of PresComm is that they have already expressed that their JCRs are already unhappy with this. Student opinion is that this is a bad move anyway.

**Tom**: We can’t have been doing that officially because we haven’t got an official stance.

**Penny**: I just want to make a point – a lot of the staff are happy to go, but it will effect the college experience and how we run the JCR and what type of things we can do for freshers and people as part of the JCR. That will change for the worse if the ops review goes ahead.

**Grover**: A lot of what we’re saying is speculation.

**Nat**: I think as a general point of support, I don’t think there’s anything wrong with expressing our opinions, even if it is already finished. A motion is still a motion and still deserves our support.

**Mary**: That isn’t what the motion is saying. What I understand about Tom’s intention is that it’s good to go into representation with the backing of your JCR. It’s more official. I don’t think that this is clear enough.

Vote: Overwhelming in favour.

Motion passes.

**MOTION: Josh Preston Thank You**

**Penny**: I thought it would be a good idea to thank Josh for working very hard. It’s worth thanking him for the precedent he set, because he allowed for future Trevs events to have the option to change. I think he deserves recognition.

**Jacob**: Any questions of substance?

**Ben**: I know you’ve stated that you think it’s because he set a precedent, but equally there are previous people who have worked tirelessly within the exec and tier 2 roles that have not received the same recognition?

**Penny**: You can write motions for the others.

**Grover**: There are so many other people who do things in face of criticism. He was an elected member in a role. You don’t see a lot of people who need thanking.

**Mary**: Tier 2s get a certificate for their role.

**Nat**: Can we amend this motion to thank the tier 2s for doing their job?

**Jacob**: This is based off the frep thank you motion.

**Mary**: This is different though. It’s a nice thing for freshers to acknowledge their freps. That’s to do with money because they get a dinner.

**Nat**: You can have motions with not much substance.

**Mary**: You can’t say when it’s based on that motion.

**Giorgio**: Like every other elected position we thank, we can give half colours when we think that someone has gone above and beyond.

**Nat**: Can they not be treated as two different things?

**Giorgio**: All the points in this are the things that fulfil a half colours application category.

**Nat**: Usually half colours tends to be more than just above and beyond.

**Ben**: Nobody is disagreeing with that. People are disagreeing that the motion itself is a little out there given the fact that nobody else.

**Penny**: I’m happy to amend it to thank all the other tier 2s.

**Ben**: If it’s a motion to thank the tier 2s it shouldn’t pass now. If you want to do that the motion should pass towards Handover.

**Grover**: When we say to officially thank – is the thanks us passing the motion? What action is going to be taken?

**Penny**: My idea was to take an official stance as a thank you. It was in a similar vein to the frep motion.

**Giorgio**: It should be resolve to thank Josh Preston – is that just like a position we take?

**Penny**: Yes.

**Robyn**: Is it thanking him specifically or every summer ball chair from now on?

**Penny**: It’s called the Josh Preston thank you motion.

**Jacob**: Does anyone have any points to add to the general comments?

**Sarah**: I don’t think Josh wants to be thanked?

**Penny**: In that case, don’t vote on it?

Vote: Overwhelmingly in disagreement.

Motion does not pass.

**MOTION: Dream Scheme 2.0**

**Robyn**: Basically DreamScheme was great last year. We’re still above the threshold of what the standing orders say that the JCR can have as a surplus. Basically there will be DreamScheme 2.0, which will happen first term next year.

**Mary**: There was a motion passed last year that if there’s a considerable surplus then the Treasurer automatically has to launch a project – doesn’t that cover this type of motion?

**Robyn**: Potentially just for the sake of transparency, I wanted to say that it will be happening again. If you think last time’s motion was sufficient for the future, that’s great.

**Mary**: I was just asking for future reference. Last time’s motion was crafted for future reference.

**Alistair**: Treasurer has to seek approval.

**Robyn**: You could amend the motion so that we can suggest the motion with FinComm. I’m happy for that to happen.

**Giorgio**: If our reserves get too high, the University are able to take money out of the accounts. DreamScheme is just a way to let the money be of use to the JCR and to stop the University from doing this.

**Ben**: It says the bank never should exceed £65k at the end of the financial year. Will anything happen because the end of the financial year is in July?

**Giorgio**: In the long run, yes.

**Robyn**: this is why my plan is for Michaelmas term. There’s a proportion of that that goes to clubs and societies because ratification has just happened.

Vote: Overwhelmingly in favour.

Motion passes.

**MOTION: Unbudgeted Expenditure**

**Giorgio**: Basically the standing orders say that any amount over £100 Robyn and I can’t approve, this rule is quite old and difficult. This is just a way of making things run smoother. For example, sports and societies photos had to go through FinComm because it was just over £100.

**Ben**: Given the fact that FinComm can only approve things up to £250, would it also be worth extending the amount that FinComm can approve? £150 difference is quite small and means that FinComm becomes more of a token committee.

**Manon**: I would suggest that things that Pres and Treasurer approve at the moment would be different because FinComm approves mostly societies’ requests.

**Giorgio**: I’m happy to add an amendment.

**Ben**: Can I make an amendment within the JCR notes that this only applies to payments that benefit the entirety of the JCR?

**Manon**: FinComm doesn’t tend to approve requests that are £350 anyway.

**Mary**: Can you read out the amendment?

**Jacob**: This only applies to payments that applies to the entire JCR, not clubs and societies specificailly.

Amendment accepted.

Vote: Overwhelmingly in favour.

Motion passes.

MEETING ADJOURNED.

**VOTES**

Vote: Overwhelming in favour.

Motion 1passes.

Vote: Overwhelmingly in disagreement.

Motion 2 does not pass.

Vote: Overwhelmingly in favour.

Motion 3 passes.

Vote: Overwhelmingly in favour.

Motion 4 passes.