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**EXEC REPORTS**

**Jacob:** Elections are happening. We’ve done constitutional review.

**Alice:** After the success of waffle trial, we’re going to do them every weekend starting tonight!

**Danielle:** Applications for Handover formal will be opening this week.

**Sarah:** Please clean up after yourselves in the Bar.

**Giorgio:** Keep filling out the BPR2 survey.

**Tom:** There’s an ongoing investigation by the University into the RON campaign. Assembly on Thursday at 6:30PM.

**Robyn:** FinComm happened.

**Jess:** Trevs Night happened.

**MOTION: CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW**

**Jacob:** Every year we do a constitutional review. I’ve emailed a list of things that Steering think should be changed. Tier 2 officers can choose to report at JCR meetings. The big one is to allow the Chair to suggest moving to a vote when discussion isn’t going anywhere. It won’t force discussion to stop or force anyone to stop speaking, but allow the Chair to officially say that the discussion goes around in circles. Stuff to do with referendums, allow posters to be used for Tier 1 elections. The second time a candidate runs uncontested, the 2/3 majority shouldn’t apply. Also the JCR hates denim, so you can wear that if you can get it past Penny and Giorgio.

Any questions of clarity or substance?

**James:** About Tier 1 posters – how would that differ to what happened to the Michaelmas elections?

**Jacob:** So those were all made by the Chair. Those were so much effort for not a huge amount of beenfit as there wasn’t any change in turnout. I wanted to give the option.

**James:** So the candidate would make it themselves?

**Jacob:** Yeah. It would still go through Steering, and it would all be shared on the Trevs page at the discretion of the Chair.

**Ben:** It wouldn’t allow people to show allegiance towards any candidate. Comments would be disabled.

**Ben:** You can vote to have the motion taken in parts – meaning that we look at it all individually.

**Jacob:** \*projector dies\* We’ll move to a vote.

Motion passes.

**MOTION: FRESHER COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT**

**Ben:** In constitutional review, Ben and I thought that the major issues with committies is that freshers have to join committees in the first week of being here. The best way we considered to do this was to elect one fewer member to each committee in Michaelmas, and start another election for two more members in January. This is to try to increase fresher involvement. Involvement at Tier 3 level often has a knock-on effect on Tier 1 and 2 positions.

**Jacob:** Questions of clarity or substance?

**James:** The people elected in January – would they serve until the next January?

**Ben:** You’d then be competing for one of only two places if that were the case – that would take places away from the second years. We would end their term at the end of the year and they can re-run.

**Anna:** Would it only be freshers?

**Ben:** It can be returners. It’s likely for the January elections, there would be a greater majority of freshers’ involvement.

**Jess:** For SocComm – it’s hard enough to get people to do decorations when there are fewer. Could we start with a higher number?

**Ben:** This was a generalisation – we could take it as it goes. SocComm might be a different case. It’s a general note that we need to review who sits on which committee as a general point.

**Jess:** Can I propose an amendment? To resolve to add one more member to SocComm on a case-by-case basis.

**Alistair:** I’ll second.

**Danielle:** Why another two elected in January? Different committees have different numbers anyway.

**Ben:** Because we don’t want to overwhelm the number of members on committees. We want to still make it a competitive election but not to limit involvement. We decided to generalise this motion but do want to look at individual committee job descriptions – some of them still mention committees that don’t exist.

**Fresher:** If positions don’t get filled in October, and some people end up running – woul;d still hold a third round of elections in January?

**Ben:** I think we would still hold the elections – people are unlikely to join committees when they haven’t seen what the committees do. In terms of other committees where they’re less visible, the impact is larger but word of mouth might encourage people to get involved.

**Jacob:** Move to a vote: **Motion passes overwhelmingly.**

**MOTION: DSO REFERENDUM**

**Giorgio:** We discussed this in December. We decided that it would be dependent upon whether the DSO changed and other things. They’re not changing the DSO – essentially they’ll be making it worse. We thought it would be worth trying to do this before Handover so the next exec can have it. Other colleges have transitioned and are going to transition – this motion basically allows the referendum to happen, as the situation has only got worse. It’s stripped back so it would be a list of pros and cons instead of teams as it’s not very interesting.

**Jacob:** When i make the election live, it will have a referendum as one of the options, and you’ll vote for or against.

Questions of clarity or substance?

**James:** Would this require 2/3?

**Jacob:** Yeah, it’s either 35% or 200 people, whichever is smaller. The referendum would need 2/3 to prove it and 200 votes to make it binding.

**Matthew:** How would this affect VAT on event tickets?

**Giorgio:** Basically, we wouldn’t lose money to VAT.

**Ben:** Did the other colleges gain additional financial benefits?

**Giorgio:** The only thing they gain was that the one finance person would do one less bank account. We could do everything under their own bank accounts.

**Jacob:** We’ll move to a vote: Motion passes overwhelmingly.

**VOTES**