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**EXEC REPORTS**

**Jacob**: Elections start tomorrow morning – please vote for the candidates. You can vote until next Sunday. I’ll announce the winners via email. The next round of elections are next term. SabbPres referendum: if you want to be involved in either side, please email me.

**Giorgio**: Survey – please do it. College plan will be published soon. Alumni restructuring will be soon. If anybody wants to join South College, you can apply.

**Jarren**: Disability awareness week starts next week – look out for us on the cobbles. Invoices for Organicups shjould be arriving soon.

**Tom**: NUS election voting closed. I’ll let you know the results soon. SU Assembly is on Tuesday at 6.30PM – I’ll be holding another SUComm meeting tomorrow. South College is called Mowlam college. Auditions for panto are tomorrow and Wednesday.

**Robyn**: FinComm happened. We spent some money.

**Danielle**: Winter Ball seating plan is out! Christmas formal will open on Tuesday. It will be first come, first served in your year group. Apply ASAP. Catering Committee happened – I’ll send out an email next week about it. There are a few issues that people aren’t aware of. Please be respectful to staff.

**DISCUSSION POINT: OPENING COMMITTEES TO THE JCR**

 **Jacob**: This came from JCRComm: the idea is that once a term, the elected committees (...) can open their meetings, it would be publicised by the committee chairs. It’s to increase engagement, allow people to get feedback. It might not work in certain committees. Does anyone have any thoughts on this – are there any alternative ways that this could be done?

**Robyn**: FinComm – there are certain things that are confidential. The committee members will have had to sign confidentiality agreements.

**Jacob**: Some committees – if you remove things that aren’t confidential, there’s nothing to discuss.

 **Robyn**: That’s the case with FinComm.

**Alice**: Is it just FinComm – can we just remove FinComm from the motion?

 **Jacob**: If anyone could come to Steering, it would be a JCR Meeting.

 **Alistair**: SocComm pre-theme announcement.

 **Robyn**: It could be after the event has been announced.

 **Alistair**: I think that it would be a better use of time to release the minutes.

**Jess**: This motion is more about making suggestions – it might be better for the chairs of the committees to publicise their meetings and let people suggest things.

 **Jacob**: Ben Bauman’s point was that if you allow anyone to say anything, it devalues the committee members.

 **Jess**: It would still allow decisions to be made from the committee members.

 **Robyn**: It would work for SocComm and WAComm – for JCR, Finance and Steering, I don’t know if it would work.

 **Jess**: Participation in WAComm and Social might be greater – people can see the effect of them easier. In terms of finacnes and Steering – it likely won’t be as popular.

 **Matthew** **B**: Surely that’s already a thing?

 **Jess**: The purpose of the motion is to increase transparency. If meetings were publicised, it would probably help this.

 **Steven**: Maybe a compromise could be that committees hold a separate open discussion, so they can see how a decision is made which wouldn’t reveal confidential information.

 **Maria**: If the purpose is to make meetings more transparent, is there any point if people don’t run? Is it worth publicising what the committees do before the election itself?

 **Jacob**: Committee elections run in the first week of term – there is limited ability. We have freshers’ fair before committee elections. It’s a good way to help people to get involved. It’s difficult to publicise to the freshers. So far, the minutes publicity as a more robust system and holding things on an individual.

 **Danielle**: Can we not publicise the anonymous feedback form after events or a meeting? If we want feedback, then people can use that – and it might help people who might not want to admit it.

**Jacob**: I think we should take a poll. Not binding.

Minutes publicising: general agreement

Anonymous feedback: general agreement

**DISCUSSION POINT: SHOULD THE JCR CONSIDER BECOMING A CHARITY?**

**Jacob**: Van Mildert have some amazing videos that you can watch if you want some more information.

**Giorgio**: We are a DSO non-profit under the University. We used to be a charity, but we became a DSO in about 2014. DSOs are basically completely under the University; they can essentially take as much money out as much as they want. We’ve had issues with trustee liability – now charities are legal entities, so that would not be a problem. Most other JCRs are non-DSOs. Last summer, Mildert and Aidan’s also became independent charities. Currently there are five other JCRs considering to leave.

Cons: we’d have to pay insurance (somewhere around 3K). We’d have to have our own accounting software that is around 3k.

Pros: any events would be VAT free – 20% cheaper. We wouldn’t have to be VAT registered, meaning that we save 20% on most things. We won’t have to follow the University’s strict financial rules, we’d have our own responsibility over our own money. We’d save 5k a year on dues VAT. It would be more transparent – all our accounts would have to be published. We’d have our own autonomy. The main pros of the DSO would be that if we went broke, the University would help – we’ve seen examples of that they don’t really.

**Giorgio:** If it was a sabbatical role: likely they’d take over the trustee board jobs. If it was a non-sabb, they would carry on with normal roles. Treasurer currently does VAT and would take over doing trustee stuff in its place. If we did a referendum, would we have to have campaign teams? Would we like to have a full-on referendum like we’re doing with SabbPres?

**Jacob**: Do we think that a full referendum (i.e. with campaign teams – posters, a period of getting people to sign up) is necessary given the nature of the question – is it more a yes/no debate?

 **James**: If the JCR was to become a charity, what would be the direct effects on students?

 **Giorgio**: Largely nothing, main effects would be on events, dues – you’d have the choice to increase your budgets because they wouldn’t be VATable. Nothing huge in day-to-day effects. Nothing major. It would mean we could do more in the guise of independence. There is more of a firm line currently.

**Steven**: The banking software would cost 3K – is this a one-off cost?

 **Giorgio**: It would be a yearly cost. It’s less than we currently spend – we’d have to go through an accountant who’s verified for charity.

 **Steven**: Would we save money?

 **Giorgio**: In theory, yes. I can’t say how much yet.

**Steven**: Is there any big risk associated with it?

 **Giorgio**: Not really – we’re seeing that Mildert are doing it really quickly. You technically have two years to set up a board of trustees – Mildert have done it within a year.

**Alistair**: What would be your plan?

 **Giorgio**: I would want to do it next term, so it could go to the next exec – so we can follow the timelines given by other colleges. We want a plan to be discussed between our execs.

 **Jacob**: That is determined by what’s going on in this discussion point. If it’s a full referendum, it would be a lot of work next term alongside the SabbPres referendum.

 **Giorgio**: My personal opinion is that you don’t need a campaign team – it would be hard to recruit campaign teams.

**Robyn**: Would it be worth us having a middle ground? There’s leeway to have questions – it would be useful to have a forum where people can ask questions?

 **Jacob**: The issue with both referendums is that if someone says something in an open forum, even if I say that it’s not acceptable, it’s still heard and it could allow people to say factually incorrect things. Not having campaign teams wouldn’t mean we couldn’t have questions.

 **Alice**: Could you have a pros and cons situation – with a list of questions and answers decided by Steering before?

 **Jacob**: Ideally, I would construct an impartial team that would try to answer those questions.

**Robyn**: There are a limited number of people who know the financial details – it wouldn’t be impartial because people wouldn’t know the answer.

**Tommy**: I think you should be careful about when you run it – if you hold it the same time as Sabb – the outcome of SabbPres affects the role. It might be overloading people with votes.

 **Giorgio**: We’ve already got lots of elections next term.

 **Jacob**: It would be five elections next term. It could be set up by me and the next Chair. Having no campaign teams makes it quicker to run an election.

**Robyn**: Is there a timeline?

 **Giorgio**: Mildert and Aidan’s got a two-year period. Grey have a referendum every two years. There’s nothing saying we can’t impose something like that.

POLL: Stripped-back referendum supported.

**MOTION: TREXIT MONEY**

 **Giorgio**: Last JCR meeting we had a discussion point about the vending machine that unfortunately can’t exist. I’ve found out how we got the money – it’s goodwill money. I spoke with Ed (MCR Pres at the time) and Janice. We’ve discovered that the money is to benefit livers-in and out. They held an emergency JCR meeting. There’s 3k left and we want to get rid of it soon. IN that meeting they discussed things very similar to what we brought to the last JCR Meeting. Basically, the concept of giving money to charity was brought up, the room generally disagreed. My thoughts of what to do with the money are: 1.5k towards events budget across the year (Winter Ball – Ents alone is less than 1.5k). 1k towards Refreshers – college want to make up for the fresher’s week. We also want livers-out to get involved. College are willing to put money towards this. There’ll be an alumni drinks event, a bop (where most of the money would go), a bingo evening. 500 towards the website update – that’s enough to pay for an anonymous welfare messaging service which is fully GDPR compliant!

**Jacob**: Qs of clarity? Qs of substance?

**Fresher**: Refreshers – in terms of the people who lived in Teikyo and Collingwood – could there be events oriented around their return?

 **Giorgio**: We did consider this – we could definitely.

**Alistair**: I’d want to caution not to make it too focused towards this year’s freshers, the fourth years might not be happy.

 **Giorgio**: We considered this and we couldn’t find a way to spend the money on them alone.

**Fresher**: the 500 towards the website – what would this cover?

 **Jarren**: We used to have an anonymous welfare messaging service – it was got rid of because it wasn’t GDPR compliant.

**Cat**: The anonymous welfare messaging service would cost £400, it would be fully GDPR compliant because it encrypts all the data that’s inputted. It’s the same system that Hatfield currently use.

**Matthew** **B**: Is it live?

 **Jarren**: The questions would go to me.

**Fresher**: Towards the events – would they be targeted? The idea was also to go towards the freshers living out – would there be exclusive events?

 **Giorgio**: We’ve realised that we haven’t had a chance to get everyone back, so everyone would be invited to everything. In terms of the events budget – Robyn or Jess would know them best.

 **Robyn**: I think that it’s up for debate – if you’ve got ideas, please let me know. Our idea would be Trevs Night, Trevs Day and potentially Summer Ball – the three big events we’ve got left for this academic year.

**VOTE**: Overwhelming majority.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**VOTES**

**Motion: Trexit money:** Overwhelming majority.