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**EXEC REPORTS**

**Tom**: SU Assembly is this Thursday. Anyone is welcome to come along. I need an SU Committee – it’s an open committee, if you’re interested, please come along

**Penny**: There’s still stash in the office if you haven’t collected it. Diss open mic night email is coming out tomorrow. Trevs Talks went well.

**Giorgio**: Renovations are pretty much complete. There’s a few flaws they’re fixing, but now everyone is back into Trevs. We’re now working out how to do the compensation stuff. The University aren’t paying the contractors. Staffing changes: Dr Latham is still absent, Lee is our acting principal, Rose is acting VP, Kim is senior administrator. Ops review – there will be a second one, we don’t know when. College planning is this month – please tell me if you have anything to add.

**Amy**: Day of the Dead was yesterday – next event is Diwali

**Jess**: We are changing Informal Ball into a formal ball, so Trevs Night can be formal.

**Jarren**: Organicup sign up is closing soon. I went to wlefare forum. We’re finding out when we need medical notes – at the moment they’re expensive. Make sure you check with your department whether you need medical notes. College can also do stuff on your behalf if you need. On behalf of Kirsty – housing campaign is happening soon.

**Alice**: Card machine is back. Hiring has happened.

**Danielle**: Formal will open on Thursday. Priority is non-finalist, fresher, finalist.

**Andrea**: I’m environment officer, this week is dedicated to food waste and the University is measuring how much food waste we create over a week and comparing it to the base line. Challenge is to have as little food waste as possible. The winner gets something.

**Ben**: Any news on special projects?

**Giorgio**: There are 17 applications, the meeting is next week.

**Jacob**: Congratulations to all those who were elected. We had a pretty good turnout for voting. Round 2 of elections closes tomorrow. Please vote. Once committee elections will finish, there’ll be tier 1 elections opening soon. Before the end of this term, we’ll have decided the next president, treasurer, buttery chair, welfare officer and publicity officer. Some positions need to be screened – basically you need to tell me that you want to run in advance, and you’ll be interviewed by college staff and current position holders.

**DISCUSSION POINT: VENDING MACHINE MONEY**

**Jacob**: Trevs had to move out for a night because building works meant there was no power. We got some compensation money for that – we voted on what to spend the money on and we voted to buy a vending machine, but there were many issues, and we haven’t got one yet. We still have the money and the vote happened two years ago now. Does anyone have any opinions – should we keep going? Should we ask people again?

**Giorgio**: It’s £3k.

**Alice**: Problems: original vote requires card machine, but college don’t want us to do that. It also would be a security risk because the previous vending machine used to be damaged repeatedly. Also it was meant to go in the Upper JCR but we can’t find a company willing to take it up the stairs.

**Jacob**: The only people left who voted are third and fourth years, and the only people affected were fourth years.

**Penny**: Can we have a second vote?

**Alice**: Could we put money into DreamScheme?

**Giorgio**: If people voted for it, then yeah.

**Jacob**: Theoretically, people voted on it originally.

**Alice**: Feasibly, the best idea would be to hire a vending machine – I don’t know if that’s something people would be keen on, but apparently it’s the best option according to college.

**Steven**: How would we restock it and how much would it cost?

**Alice**: It would be under the umbrella of the Buttery – money from it would go towards the restocking of it.

**Steven**: So it would cover its own costs?

**Jarren**: What could we get at this point?

**Alice**: We could get one without a card machine, your standard one. We talked about potentially sandwiches – we’d need to confirm with catering about this.

**Ben**: I don’t know – given the fact that the people affected are now in fourth year, and by now they wouldn’t get the benefit. Could we put the budget into small events budgets to make them better?

Fresher: If Alice says the most feasible option is to hire one until the 3k runs out, would it be worth putting into something people will remember?

**Ben**: What is the current summer ball budget?

**Matt B**: 3k would be very nice.

**Giorgio**: It’s about 23-24k.

**Matthew**: It’ll be bigger and better.

**Jess**: It’s double the small events budget – it could make the events much better than they are.

**Alice**: Would it be more feasible to vote on stick with original plan or puyt money into a budget?

**Jacob**: Might be feasible to put it to a vote. This is purely discussion.

**Jess**: Theoretically we could put it towards a new event?

**Matthew**: Could we put it towards DreamScheme?

**Andrea**: The people who should be compensated aren’t here anymore – could we donate the money to something? Like maybe planting trees – we already have a fair few events, summer ball is already really good – do we need to add more money to it?

**Giorgio**: This money was compensation for not living in college – in theory the money is meant to compensate them and the JCR.

Would it be worth putting money towards an event specifically for the people affected?

**Jacob**: More than half have already graduated.

**Ben**: We’ve almost come full circle – could we hold a refreshers event to compensate the freshers from this year? Tie it into having a new event – refreshers hasn’t really been a big event in the past years.

**Steven**: If we use the money to compensate the freshers, when we get compensated, we’ll just be stuck with more money.

**Giorgio**: Any compensation currently given will be given directly to students rather than to the JCR.

**Tommy**: I think Ben and I are meant to do something for refreshers anyway – after working with Jess, 3k to another event would make a huge difference.

**Ben**: To give scale, we spent 1900 on ents for the freshers’ bop – almost 40% loss. Freshers week budget is about 4500.

**Tommy**: How quickly could we vote on it? To kick in and be able to prep stuff...

**Jacob**: Next meeting is at the beginning of December, and I could get it voted on by the end of term.

**Ben**: We’d have to actively say to other years, especially fourth years that they can come and it isn’t just for the freshers.

**Jacob**: The exec can then discuss this and figure out something to do. Check this space.

**MOTION: INTERNATIONAL WELFARE OFFICER**

**Jarren**: Welfare Officers have to be fully trained by the SU. Recently, there’s been mental health training for all students to access, there’s various peer support techniques. There’s a lot of training to vibe done and due to time constraints it’s really hard to get around this. Recently we’ve been thinking of changing up international rep. International rep is also in a welfare position, so it would work out.

**Amy**: I got to be Nightline trained, and I always find myself asking Jarren about training. How am I supposed to be in a welfare position if I’m not fully trained?

**Jarren**: Part of this is also – since assistant welfares are finding it hard. There would be more incentive for assistants to go to trainings. The SU has dates and there’s no flexibility.

**Amy**: Ideally it would also help the person with the role – in theory it would make International Rep’s job easier.

**Jacob**: Any questions of clarity? Questions of substance?

**Ben**: My concern with this is that you almost put international students’ rep in a sub-tier where they are almost reporting to welfare officer – but as tier 1 they should have people reporting to them?

**Jarren**: In this situation, assistant welfares don’t necessarily have to be there during frepping. In this, confidentiality is never promised in the sense that it goes straight up so there’s no necessity to report to me.

**Jarren**: Nightline training is a two-day training between 8:30 and 5:30 where you’re taught how to do active listening – not as a therapist, but taught how to engage with people and help them self-reflect. Other relevant trainings report on that.

**VOTE:** Overwhelming majority. Motion passes.

**MOTION: SABBATICAL PRESIDENT REFERENDUM**

**Giorgio**: There’s a little bit of history about this – about 16 years ago, we thought about making JCR president sabbatical – a paid member of staff for the common room, where they’d do more admin stuff to take away from the load of the exec. There was a vote but there were campaigning problems. DSO non-common rooms and common rooms all have at least one sabb role. Castle are also equally considering making a sabb pres role. In terms of what this means, appendix B shows the pres job description and C shows the DSO job descriptions.

**Jacob:** If you want to read them, you can check my email from yesterday. Basically, they say what president does, what he would do, etc.

**Giorgio**: Appendix A is a what to do. This motion doesn’t say we will or we won’t but we should vote on whether we should. If the referendum goes through, it wouldn’t be until 2021 because of handover times. This is the only way the working group can work under DSO rules. If you vote yes in the motion, in the referendum all exec will be impartial.

**Jacob**: Basically, there’s a lot of confusing terminology in this.

**Giorgio**: DSO: non-profit structure that the University has put us under.

**Jacob**: Part of this is making sure that people are aware of what they’re voting for. If this passes, we will have a referendum for which there will be two campaign teams to support the outcomes of the questions that steering committee propose. Steering’s job will be to make sure that they don’t break the rules. In the past this has gone wrong. This isn’t that vote – this is discussing whether we should have a completely new vote, unrelated to the previous vote. It won’t be something that people can’t be involved in.

**Jacob**: Questions of clarity? Notes summarises the current situation. Believes has some opinions, resolves says about what we’re going to do.

**Fresher**: Are we able to change the DSO job description?

**Giorgio**: No – in fairness it isn’t a bad job description for the role. They can be changed slightly. Only other thing to add is that if in a referendum we voted yes, there is the money. It isn’t a question of finance.

**Fresher**: If the sabb role, would it be a Trevs graduate?

**Giorgio**: They would have to be a member of the common room – they’d have to be from Trevs.

**Jacob**: Questions of substance?

**James**: Will this referendum be binding?

**Jacob**: Yes.

**Matthew**: Will you need to surpass 50%?

**Jacob**: This referendum will need 25% turnout. It would need 66% of the vote to change a job description.

**Ben**: In the last vote it was difficult to avoid bias and having opinions. How would you, as Chair, maintain the legitimacy of a vote?

**Jacob**: Steering committee would help me. Quite a few people in steering watched the last referendum happen – we have an idea of what we don’t want to happen this time. With more planning and more clarity of what people are allowed to say. Specifically from mine and steering’s point of view: try to make people aware of what they can’t say.

**Ben**: Would you stop people from running, including former members of the exec?

**Jacob**: I would let former exec run. It would be on case-by-case basis. It would be similar to the situation with current exec members. Members of the exec have weight to their words.

**Giorgio**: Any material going through this would be fact-checked by Steering.

**Fresher**: What went wrong last time?

**Jacob**: One of the campaign teams sent out posters with false information on them. The president of the time made a speech that could have been construed as opinion. People wanted their voices to be heard.

**Ben**: What is the money currently spent on?

**Giorgio**: It’s surplus – which is why DreamScheme has come about.

**Steven**: How would it work with Handover?

**Giorgio**: Logistical staff would work it out – other colleges have handovers at different times. We would have a year and a half to plant this.

**Penny**: We also have a start on that topic – we had a working group last year.

**Jacob**: In the aftermath of the previous referendum, a working group was set up to disucss various options.

**Andrea**: Where can the documents be found?

**Jacob**: They were emailed at the time. They’re also in the minutes from the meeting at the time.

**Ben**: Amendment to put them on the website.

**Giorgio**: I accept the amendment.

**Jacob**: Any other questions? We’ll move to a vote.

**VOTE**: Overwhelmingly in favour.

**VOTES**

**International Welfare Officer: VOTE**: Overwhelmingly in favour. Motion passes.

**Sabbatical President Referendum: VOTE:** Overwhelming majority. Motion passes.