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**PRESENT**

James Koo **President**

Bex Smith **Vice President**

- **Treasurer**

Isabelle Smith **Welfare Officer**

- **Social Chair**

Sarah Margerison **Publicity Officer**

- **Clubs & Societies Officer**

Dan Wattis **Technical Manager**

Andrew Hamilton **JCR Chair**

Livia Zuercher **Buttery Chair**

**Apologies:**

Helena O’Neil **Welfare Officer**

Sam McMahon **Sabbatical** **Bar Steward**

**EXEC REPORTS**

**BS:** Stash drop this week, lots of new items! Meetings with James, getting to know everyone.

**JK:** Bonding the new exec together. Working on Trevs Day and Summer Ball, mostly planned by now. Filling in for Treasurer and Social Chair whilst they are not currently elected.

**SM:** So far, I’ve mostly been trying to promote this meetings and these upcoming elections, hopefully will be effective.

**IZ:** Bigggest job so far has been planning Stress Less, well under way. Also been planning Drop-ins and meeting with college staff.

**LZ:** Buttery still hasn’t burnt down (joke). Learning how to do the rota and shifts. Put out the exec roles for the Butter.

**DW:** Planned all of the tech for Trevs Day. Tech stash is coming. Also we have tech committee, please join if you would like. Also been covering for Clubs & Societies Officer – Socities Formal on Thursday.

**AH:** Sending lots of emails about elections and this meeting. Trying to get lots of nominations. Reviewing the way we run JCR meetings, etc. Termly constitutional review with Steering Committee.

**MOTION 1: Anonymous JCR Review Form**

*Proposed by: Bex Smith*

*Seconded by: Matthew Hall*

**Summary: This motion would introduce an anonymous form to enable all JCR members to voice their opinions on JCR systems, and to suggest ideas that could improve the JCR. This form would replace JCR Committee.**

**Spoken summary:** scrap the JCR committee and replace it with a year-round JCR review form. Non-elected members of JCR committee are mostly reps that not longer exist. The gorm would be a Microsoft form that would be monitored by the Vice President. Brief histoy of JCR Committee and what they used to do (awards panel, etc). Awards panel: replacing those on this panel who where members of JCR Committee with two random Tier 2s (same with any other mention of committee members being needed to sit on).

**Question 1:** Question surrounding awards panel – do we need wider representation? Whether it is a good idea to keep the awards panel as a centralised decision?

**Answer:** currently the people who sit on the awards panel are people from the JCR Committee (they are elected). Functionally would not change with the Tier 2s. Non-JCR members are not really representative. Replacing elected individuals with elected indivuals.

**Question 2:** someone who has sat on awards committee. Often, people see the awards ceremony as an opportunity for a “JCR clique” to pat themselves on the back. Agree with previous comment. While it is in theory random, it is not because of the number of Tier 2s. Argue they have more of a sway or bias.

**Answer:** Happy to amend to Tier 3s also (elected ones), etc steering or fincom.

**Question 3:** Formal recognition of thanks panel is different to the panels for the other awards. Is the idea that all three levels of awards would be the same committee of people?

**MH:** Anywhere where the wording is ‘JCR committee members’ would replace with Tier 2s. Just changing the pool of people that is JCR committee.

**BS:** Essentially want to widen the committee with the review, to everyone.

**MH:** Answers questions and wants for anonymous forums.

**Question 4:** Elected member of the committee – we have met once, done nothing. This would be a good way to get the involvement we need, recorded process.

**BS:** Yes, not just the end of every year.

MOTION PASSED BY VOTE.

**MOTION 2: Welfare Campaign Committee Reform Motion**

*Proposed by: Sarah McCutcheon*

*Seconded by: Izzy Smith*

**Summary: This motion will change the tier 3 Welfare Campaigns Committee (WCC) to be unelected, similar to events committee. This will allow people to help out with anycampaigns they are passionate about without needing to work on all campaigns.**

**SM:** Necessary and beneficial. Open up the committee to a more general audience – people can do what they want, don’t have to do every campaign. Not limited to the elections, therefore some campaigns which are normally missed by the committee will not be. Good when the Welfare team is light on numbers. The committee does not require Welfare training, not needed for elections. Good change, consulted between previous Welfare officers.

**No questions.**

MOTION PASSED BY VOTE.

**MOTION 3: VONC Rewrite Motion**

*Proposed by: James Koo*

*Seconded by: James Gowers*

**Summary: As it currently stands, our process for a Vote of No Confidence (hereafter VONC) is unclear, too simplistic, and doesn’t provide any sort of proper process in relation to timings or information to be passed onto the individual being subject to VONC. Furthermore, it is almost word for word identical to the VONC framework found in the DSO Framework (hereafter DF) with the only difference being how many signatures are required, whereas the majority of other DSO Colleges have redrafted based on the framework but do not share the same wording.**

**JK:** Rewrite process for a VONC. Make it so the VONC is proposed after two motions of censure are proposed. Make it more fair, transparent. Currently within the standing orders there are no timeframes or requirement for the chair to say why the VONC has been put forward.. The no timeline is an issue because it does not allow for consideration for the person in question. Only been one VONC in recent years.

Other issues, our framework lifted from the DSO framework – every other college has updated this. South is the only one who is similar and they were established after the DSO framework was last updated. Standing order also do not specify other specifics surrounding elects and tier 2s. Motion of censure – ten signatures – to the chair – then to a panel.

Basically more openness and awareness to the individual who this being being brought against.. Action plan. Instances – give them a chance to change, if they are still not up to code then a second censure is put in place. This needs 30 signatures and then it can go through.

Wants to change some of this censure – change 30 to 35. Automatic vote of no confidence (see the notes of the proposal). Timeframe – about a week when it is tabled – give the VONC-ee chance to prepare – can send speech to the chair. Can also say if something has upset them in the process.

Transparency and openness. Emergency powers to the chair. Information that might invalidate. Giving a bit more power to make sure things aren’t out of hand. AMMENDMENT: joint position holders, can vonc just one of them only, not automatically both (panel/censure decides if it should be one or both of them, etc).

**Question:** A lot of previous times, when there have been issues, a system more like this has been unofficialy used. So this is more upholding this in an official manner. So it is less extreme levels, and etc.

LOST QUORUM – MOTION PUT TO AN ONLINE VOTE.

**MOTION 4: Termly constitutional review**

*Proposed by: Andrew Hamilton*

*Seconded by: Emilia Harcourt*

**Summary: A constitutional review of the JCR’s governing documents (the Standing Orders and Job Descriptions) is carried out annually by members of the Steering Committee, headed by the JCR Chair. This motion seeks to ratify their proposed changes.**

**AH:** In previous meeting, AH moved constitution review to be termly. Just short, to do with wording. Post-offer visit days representatives. SCR on the panel. Fines/community service – can no longer do – remove them unless college say elsewise. HLM and Colours panel – wording – member of staff can get the award – should be provision in place for former members of staff or JCR members who have dropped out to still get consideration for the awards.

Should revert back to an annual review but can do additional ones unless needed. Just a general tidy-up.

QUORUM NOT REACHED – MOTION PUT TO AN ONLINE VOTE.

**Discussion point: What desserts should we have at JCR meetings?**

**AH**: Cheaper by doing desserts instead of pizza.

**BS:** This is mainly for the benefit of livers in who don’t get dessert as part of catering.

**AH:** Opinions? Just to consider people’s opinions and etc.

**JCR Member:** Pizza better for livers out? As they are missing dinner time to come here.

**BS**: Our point is cost.

**JCR Member:** pizza not a food incentive as a liver out. Dessert better for both.