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**PRESENT**

Dorian Held **President**

Mudit Tulsianey **Vice President**

Clementina Vong **International Rep**

Emma Rohe **Welfare Officer**

George Little **Treasurer**

Grace Moore **Services Officer**

Jim Lin **Social Chair**

Roshni Vachhani **Publicity Officer**

Thomas Hewitt **Chair**

William Brown **SU Representative**

Aparna Sah **PoC Rep**

Akshita Singh **PoC Rep**

Piper Lane **Assistant Treasurer (Buttery)**

Alysia Orbell **LGBT+ Rep**

Sarah McCutcheon **Assistant Welfare Officer**

Matthew Hall **Assistant Welfare Officer**

**Apologies**:

George Scholey **Bar Sabb**

James Taylor **Buttery Chair**

**INDIVIDUAL REPORTS**

DH: One of my main projects has been working with Sports Rep for sports dinner which was a successful event. Set up two groups, one to smoothen system for payroll and onboarding for bar workers and buttery workers. The other group is improving communications with DSU associations and our welfare team. I’ve been working on handover and communication with the new exec. Been working and negotiating for Summer Ball

MT: Trevs Talks went well. Diss Open Mic Night this week with Durham international week.

CV: Next Tuesday will be the last language café that I host, it is Durham global week this week. Do get involved!

ER: Working with Alysia for LGBT+ Event. Had Gyn Week and then in last week of term mini stress less and will be preparing for stress less week for Easter Term.

GL: Catching up for most events. The last of events happening is charity ball this Saturday. Also doing final touches for Trevs Night. Starting to look at the budget for handover.

GM: Since the last meeting we had a catering committee meeting where we presented feedback about catering and formals to college and catering. Sign ups for handover formal closes tomorrow would be great to see you there!

JL: Trevs Night feedback form has been sent out. There will be a bar night after handover formal.

RV: Since last week meeting, we’ve started a project called People of Trevs to share our gratitude for staff that work to make our Trevs Experience.

JT: One of the toastie machine is slightly broken and so has ordered a new one!

TH: I’ve been working for this meeting, have 2 new ratified societies and final round of voting opens tomorrow

WB: DSU Officers elections, we had the most votes so we get donkeys for Trevs Days. There is a meeting with assembly next week which has 2 agenda points about anti-spiking and DSU awards

LGBTea on 11th March

**Discussion Point – Thanking College Staff**

This is a discussion point to thank college staff that works behind the scenes. Thought it would be nice as a JCR to say thank you, like porters, catering team, cleaners etc. Any ideas.

GL: A video to get as many people as possible to say thank you.

DH: We were thinking of doing something before handover

TH: Okay, we will leave it there and if anyone has any ideas send them over to Dorian

**Constitutional Review Motion**

AS: The steering committee every year takes up a constitution review to brush up the language and makes sure that it aligns with what currently happens.

*Went through each point of change.*

Q: For point 9, Assistant Principal doesn’t make sense as doesn’t want to be on screening panel.

A: What they will be on is an Interview Panel. Not Screening panel.

Q: Similarly, why is president not there?

A: Interesting point, this was mainly amending the wording. If this is something you want we can make an amendment. This is also because of workload, if you want to be on it that’s fine.

I think it is worth because president deals with a lot during freshers week, at least the president elect should be on the interview panel.

Q: Along the lines of that, international rep was also on the panel. Could we add that international rep and other exec positions holders can optionally sit on the panel.

A: Yeah, could add it. If the international rep can go it would be good.

Q: You have an interview panel suggesting like 7 people. If we want more people to be freps, would people honestly need 7 people asking questions? I understand why its important, is 7 really necessary?

A: Most of the time, I don’t think all 7 are available. This ensures that each concern is addressed. Ultimately it is very much up to the head frep if they would like to accept certain people. Other people would be necessary to help raise or address different points.

Q: About point 14, is there is a reason why college staff are only available to give out HLM and not of any other words.

A: I think the issue is about HLM specifically, and we want to keep it up to date with what currently happens.

A: I don’t see why we can’t nominate staff for other awards.

A: What other awards are there?

A: There is colours, HLM, formal recognition of thanks

*Motion overwhelmingly passed*

**Job Description Amendment Motion**

DH: This is similar, in line with previous motion, in terms of making sure job description matches what we do or should be doing.

TH: All the changes are available to see in the email, there is a word document with quite a few changes.

DH: Yeah and Emma has also proposed a JCR Welfare Confidentiality Agreement to make it more in line for the welfare team

*Exec shared what they added / changed*

Q: For the minority rep documents, Can we change it to welfare training

Q: In AWO can we add relevant welfare training

A: Yes, we accept those

Q: Whats the difference between the current confidentiality agreement and the proposed agreement

A: The welfare agreement basically says that you can only talk to someone else like AP if you believe that person is in harm of themselves or others.

*Motion overwhelmingly passed*

**Abolition of the Communities Representative Motion**

DH: This motion is to reform the Communities Rep role to be more specific and more aligned with what the JCR needs. The existing role ‘stitched together’ a range of responsibilities and is very broad. This has meant elements of the role, like the relationship with clubs and societies and volunteering, has not been able to be developed as the original Communities Rep reform intended. The motion proposes to replace the Communities Rep with a new Tier 1 Clubs and Societies Officer, move its responsibility for volunteering to the Charity Officer, create a new Tier 2 Livers Out under the Welfare Officers to represent livers out/do the housing campaign and move its responsibility for careers to the Vice President.

Q: How would the Clubs and Societies Officer differ from what the Sports Rep already does, share some same responsibilities, e.g. society photos and liaising with sports societies?

A: Makes more sense for C&S Officer to organise the society photos as the Sports Rep does not normally deal with music societies. Also important for clubs and society representation to be at an executive level.

Q: What would the C&S Officer be doing on a day-to-day basis, many of the other Exec roles are very busy, here you are splitting an existing Exec role into 3, will its workload be enough? Also moving volunteering to an already very busy Charity Officer, is this reasonable?

A: Important for C&S to hold busy Tier 2s accountable and make sure there is a good channel of communication between them and the Exec and making sure this isn’t marred by other responsibilities. Volunteering currently not a very onerous responsibility currently. Amendment from proposer to add responsibility for Pool Table from Services Officer.

Q: C&S Officer is proposed to stay in the same place in the order of precedence of Exec roles in the job descriptions, despite it having less work in comparison with other Exec roles. Why is this?

A: I didn’t think very deeply about its ranking. Not able to properly decide about its relative workload when the role does not yet exist.

Q: Understand Communities Rep role was too broad, but workload too small. Based on the job descriptions it feels like in substance they won’t have much work to do or actually take up much of their time.

Q: Possibly review the role in a year’s time when know how much work the role actually involves?

Q: Could it not be a Tier 2 instead given its workload?

A: Open to a review in a year’s time. Understand concerns about substance but thinks we should give a shot, responsibilities could be added. Greater formal communication with clubs and societies needs developing. Depends on how much they put in. In terms of relegating it to a tier 2, already has existing Tier 2s, like Music Rep, these would have to be restructured.

*Vote taken: For: 29, Against: 0, Abstentions: 9*

*Motion passes, reaching two thirds majority threshold.*

**Candidate Objections Procedure Motion**

WB: In the past, candidates for high-ranking positions in the JCR were asked questions by an interview panel of college staff, this panel fell out of usage. Last year, the current system was brought in quickly. WB explains how the current system work [see motion summary]. States there are significant disadvantages of the current system: there is no mechanism to defend yourself, or appeal the decision of Steering Committee and Steering Committee cannot consider the veracity of the claims. Not very fair or morally upright. Also, there is the problem that the system would be unlawful if we were taken to court. WB images that the Chair is ashamed of the system if he ever discussed it with other Chairs ***[JCR Chair intervenes to clarify that WB does not know what he thinks about the current system and that as Chair he is impartial. WB acknowledges he was speculating]****.* WB states we need a new system but should first abolish the current system.

Q: What would happen with objections while there was no system in place for future elections?

A: There would be no mechanism for objections to be submitted, this would be for a short amount of time, hopefully only for one round of elections, a couple of months. There was of course once no objections system for elections before the current system was introduced. Also, there will still be other means of complaining to the university, just not directly in the JCR Elections Process.

Q: On the role of Steering Committee and whether it is possible for them to carry out this task. They were elected by the JCR with a specific mandate to carry out these responsibilities. The current objections procedure requires them to weigh the context and nature of the objection in question against the nature of the elected positions. This means it requires reasoning and balancing different consideration, a jury in real life does this and law and history students do this, many of whom typically make up the composition of Steering. You said that the current system has it flaws and I agree, but right now you are not proposing an alternative system, so surely the current system is the best system until an alternative system is developed?

Q: Can I add an amendment to motion to the say that an alternative system will be explored and proposed because we are removing a lot of stuff from the Standing Orders but we are not resolving it as there is no proposal to put a new system in place?

A: WB accepts the amendment ‘The JCR Executive Committee commits to bring forward a motion proposing a new objections system with all haste’. The motion to repeal the current system is intended as a stopgap and negotiations are ongoing with college. In reply to the point about the role of Steering, there are questions about whether anybody can be asked to make these kinds of decisions. States there have been questions about whether Steering might need additional training or whether anyone can receive the necessary training. Steering does an amazing job (I used to sit on there) but question about whether anyone can do this or whether as a JCR we can bestow that level of judgement on people.

Q: Why won’t college staff talk to the JCR about reforming the system?

A: College won’t touch us with a barge pole because of this system. They won’t talk with us about a new system because this system is so utterly naff, so we have to get rid of this system in order to reform the system. ***[Questions from the floor about whether this assertion is accurate]*** Clarification from DH that college have expressed concerns about the current system and that if invited as an observer (as is stipulated under the present system) they would decline to attend, but confirms that the JCR Exec is in talks about how the current system can be reformed. ***[WB realises he misspoke and clarifies the JCR is in talks with college about reforming the current system, and acknowledged the wording of the motion ‘That there are ongoing discussions with the college about their potential involvement in any objections or screening process’]***

Q: Objections are entirely anonymous, and their factual validity cannot be questioned. Person who is objected against doesn’t know anything about this and cannot refute the objection made against them – that is awful. Important to move past this.

A: Thank you, I agree.

*Vote taken: For: 29 Against: 0 Abstentions: 9*

**JCR Chair:** I can’t give a ruling on the motion right now. The meeting is no longer quorate so I need to go away and consult about what effect that has on the motion and whether to take the quorum count from the start of the meeting or from the vote count. 2 people off quorum. In response to injections from the floor that a new person had just entered the room, the Chair said it would not be appropriate to retake the vote as they were not present for the discussion. I am going to have to go away and look at the Standing Orders in detail and consult. The rules are the rules about quorum and I need to go away and look at the Standing Orders. I hope people understand that’s why. We need a quorum of 40 people in the room for a decision to be binding and we no longer have 40 people in the room. The rules are there for a reason. You understand me that this places me in a very difficult position, but I have to do what the Standing Orders tell me. I don’t want to make an instant judgement. And if people feel differently, that’s fine, I’m happy to take representations and I will make an official announcement in the next few days, hopefully tomorrow. **[The Chair subsequently decided on Monday 6th, following consultations, that the last motion was not binding as a quorum was not present when the vote was taken. He furthered ruled that he had decided to use the power given to him under clause 5.6.5.8. of the Standing Orders to call an online vote on the motion, there having been no quorum]**

**AOB**

TH: The Chair thanked the current Exec for their work and Tier 2 position holders and Tier 3 Committee Members and all those who attend JCR Meetings.