

# JCSU ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

Minutes of the OGM of the JCSU on 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2016 at 7pm in the Webb Library.

**Present:** the President (Daisy Eyre), the Vice-President (Ellen Parker), the Treasurer (Anand Sharma), the Secretary (Jamie Sandall), the Services Officer (Christina Lane), the Communications Officer (George Thompson), the Green Officer (Tim Lennox), the Welfare Officers (Joe Hamilton & Rebecca Lewis), the Mental Health and Disabilities Officer (Eddie Conway), the LGBT+ Officer (Andy Burnett) and the Racial Equalities Officer (Ore Ogunbiyi).

## 1. Executive reports of actions since last OGM

AB – performing welfare duties

CL – got the pool table, this term focus group on caff and sorting out TV situation

TL – ran food collection at end of last term. Trailed recycling bins,

GT – sitting on communications and website committee, bulletins

EC – ordered journals and coloured overlays, trying to get wrist supports, attended meeting on university counselling service

ASh – reimbursing people, attending meetings with Finance office

EP – going to meeting on various issues including caff, CUSU council meetings, wrote a letter to University Counselling service

RL/JH – more welfare training, events scheduled for the term, survive and succeed workshop

DE – organised and pushed through new daily deal, interviewed new college Counsellor (Anna), meetings with senior management, prevent committee meeting – made sure an appeal process was assured, President's bulletins, annual survey report. CUSU council meeting (02/05/16) budget pushed back, coordinator role stopped, NUS disaffiliation referendum passed (some point this term)

OO – went to prevent committee, working on setting up BME intercollegiate families for Fresher's, sorting out film nights for later in terms

## 2. Members' questions to the Executive

Tansy Brasncombe (TB) – any progress on cockerel?

OO – went to College Council, will be down from hall permanently. College discssing with University whether it should be repatriated

George Gould (GG) – what is the financial value of cockerel?

OO – priceless to me, as far as I'm aware tens of thousands

George Gould – would you reconsider if it was more valuable?

GT – not relevant to current discussion, need to move on

### 3. Junior Treasurer report on JCSU Enterprise Account

ASh – enterprise account separate account controlled by JCSU, I ensure all running smoothly. Received Team First payment (£35). Pizza payment for last OGM.

### 4. Ordinary Motions

#### ***(a) Changing the name of the position of racial equalities officer***

OO – currently Racial Equalities officer, current name is inaccurate description of role. Need to change for clarity, want to make it clear that I am representing minorities. Not to suggest you cannot be a victim of racism if not from minority, this due to the distinction between racism and racial prejudice. Want to make it clear my role attends to this often overlooked difference. Most other roles in the University are known by the proposed name. There are variations that I am open to. Across the country BME is a recognised term. This has to go through two OGMs to pass

GT – no points of opposition, motion passes nem con

#### ***(b) Self-Defining Voting for the position of Racial Equalities Officer/BME Officer***

OO – if we are going to be more specific about role, then this needs to be extended to voting. We will strongly discourage people from voting if they do not self identify from that group, we cannot directly prevent. All the roles will be on each ballot paper, but those not from those groups will be encouraged not to vote. Will not be enforced by the JCSU. This will also have to go through two OGMs.

DE – the assumption will be you won't vote in this category if you're not a member of it

GT – opens the floor to questions and points of opposition

EC – how will this work for standing for role?

OO – not proposing that, but after name change I think that would be next step

Mathew Sample (MS) – what would be the effect of this motion if you can't stop people?  
Not sure what it will do?

OO – JCSU will strongly discourage people from voting unless self-identify from a minority group

AD – given this will take two OGMs would it not make sense to just put it in now? There does not seem to be massive opposition in the room

TB – the practical result would be that there would be fewer votes for the position but it would be more reflective, makes sense in the case of the Woman's officer

Rachel Pomery (RP) – can't help but notice the LGBT+ officer is an analogous position; would it be time effective of putting an equivalent amendment attached to this?

DE – didn't want to impose this on any title, would be unwilling to propose it without it being suggested by people who self-identify in that group

AB – in my view a large part of my role is welfare, would be unfair to exclude those from the election who might want to see me during time in office

GT – invites amendments

OO – Amendment: JCSU resolves: that during committee election only individuals who self identify as Black or minority ethnic can run for the role

AD – second amendment

GT – no opposition, passed nem con

### **(c) University sport centre levy**

Aiden Golden – withdrawing motion, turns out College is more amenable to paying this on behalf of the JCSU

### **(d) Introduction of Emergency Meetings**

EC – No provision to hold meetings over unexpected issues (such as CUSU referendums). Need to be able to democratically voice opinions of pressing issues. Current constitution is inadequate, there is a 20-person provision but the time windows are too short in which to hold a vote within college. Single issue meetings need to be able to held in time.

ASh – seconded

AG – if this passed would need to give people a couple of days' notice, would attendance be sufficient for this to be legitimate standpoint for the JCSU to take?

EC – firstly, would have to publicise it extremely heavily. Could introduce a system where people could email through views. Confident we can get an adequate amount of people in a few days

AD – is this an OGM?

EC – no, single issue

AD – would a decision be reached?

EC – yes but non-constitutional issues only

AD – if it's a change to the constitution there will need to be a referendum on that. Recommendation would be that it passes as JCSU policy, could introduce into standing order

GT – need to think what it would be serving as a meeting, main thing is to gauge student support

AG – creating a new meeting type, would have to go through referendum

DE – hole in the JCSU constitution to quickly gauge student opinion on issues, in concurrence that too short a warning time is undemocratic.

OO – if I'm right an extraordinary meeting can be called if you need to eject a member of the executive, could we not just amend that clause?

AD – comes back to question of whether JCSU is prepared to have a referendum. No system currently in place. There needs to be a facility for people to express their views on the matter. Would you want this to be binding?

EC – the referendum rules on disabled student referendum would have to have an open meeting passed for the JCSU to 'officially' support. Hopefully these issues will be very important to they will be well attended.

TB – wondering what the current policy is on doing an online poll that might be able to gauge student opinion? Would that not be easier?

DE – in the particular case of the Disable Student Referendum we had to hold an open meeting

EC – might be wrong, but might have had to have a referendum

AG – what was the timeframe for the Disable Student Referendum, could we not avoid the issue and think a little but further ahead

DE – in that instance it was the organisation of CUSU that prevented a meeting

AD – what is the timescale for a non-JCUS member calling a meeting?

EC – must happen within a week, not long enough for certain issues though

RP – curious about what did go wrong there? What are the logistics of CUSU?

DE – were not aware of the rules until it was too late

EC – it was widely known that it was happening, but announced details very last minute

OO – would it still then be easier to amend that clause that already exists? Would still have to go through referendum but would cover a number of these issues. Could be more accommodating within existing constitution?

TB – share some concerns about making a decision in a short amount of time, might not be a balanced turn out. Think online platform would be a better solution for the future.

AD – don't know what CUSU rules are on that sort of thing, sure they would have a constitutional window that would probably be much longer. Potentially a way forward would be to look at CUSU constitution and see length of time they give, and if we don't think it's sufficient then we change. If we can't hold a meeting in a shorter window than them need to campaign for them to change, or amend our own constitution

RP – to clarify, what were the timing issues? Would you have had to hold an OGM in those three days? As far as I'm aware the last referendum had the largest turnout ever, how is it undemocratic to assume that they wouldn't turn up to a meeting such as that being proposed?

RL – if we were holding a meeting would be a few hours. The level of commitment for CUSU referendum is less effort (more time and platforms)

DE – not fair to expect people to reorganise their lives on such a short time scale

OO – regarding checking CUSU's policy, this motion is for other issues as well. We would still need to clarify where we stand

TB – is the CUSU scenario the only time when we are required to hold an open meeting to clarify JCSU's stance. Would there be anything stopping us to hold a poll?

DE – within our rights to have a position without asking, but I am not sure whether that is acceptable

AD – can't think of any other issues that would require us to come up with an immediate standpoint, don't tend to need an emergency position on other issues. Very important that we don't shorten the time on coming to important decisions, people who are concerned may not be able to come. More important to come to a reflective decision, than rush to one

AG – to follow on, students elect you to make decision on our behalf. People put trust in you, can't see a scenario where it's necessary unless CUSU mandate it – don't want to make point of opposition though

TB – would rather JCSU remain neutral if the majority is not overwhelming

RP – we have to be ahead of them for CUSU but is it not better to have a meeting where you voting in a way that might be slightly bias? If you have had no meeting you have no idea what the opinion is.

ASh – CUSU constitution says need to advertise for seven term days

DE – have touched on all the important points

GT – problem on what we move to a vote on, don't we need more specific wording? Concern is that constitution needs to make sense

ASh – is it binding?

DE – no, goes through another meeting so doesn't matter if we pass something boarder. Believe we have touched on important issues; people are adequately equipped to vote. Call to a vote

TB – want to be clear that I have raised points of opposition

Yes - 6

No - 9

Abstentions – 6

GT – motion rejected

***(e) Meat-Free Mondays***

TL - think it would be a great idea to have a meat reduction day in caff. To live a sustainable life much easier to eat one less meat meal than other things such as reducing jet travel. Would be great to do something whilst still also having an option for meat. Easier than having a Veggie week. Would not necessarily be on a Monday. One meat option on that day, rest veggie.

Seconded – OO

GT - questions

AD – assuming you would communicate this to students and staff?

TL – very much so, would highlight the fact that something good was being done

GT – opposition?

GG – Don't like the moral authority that is being used, implying that vegetarianism it is an inherently good thing. Don't think caff should be politicised. Don't accept the counter to this that there is one meat option, the reserve applies. The fact the majority of college eats meat is being disregarded. As DE has raised there are not many people here, and any outcome might not be a democratically reflective

GT – on the democratic issue, this has been well publicised and people would be able to turn it over in the future if they disagreed so that is not an issue

TL – this is us gaining some form of mandate. When we did double sided printing we gave people a chance to voice options. I think there would be more moral friction to a veggie week, but don't think it as applicable in this instance

OO – this is not an undemocratic way to reach a decision. You are entitled to raise a constitutional amendment if you believe this process to be undemocratic. Not correct to suggest this is undemocratic, it is not according to the current constitution

GG – there are clearly not many people here

DE – I did say this is less democratic than I would like it to be. Pragmatically speaking it is very necessary to have the OGM so this is what we have to deal with, outcome is valid

GG – online poll suggested, I think that should happen before this motion is proposed

DE – quite a lot of the issues tonight have affected the wider population

AG – procedural motion to take it to a vote

GT – no opposition, procedural motion passes. Move to a vote

Yes – 14

No - 3

Abstentions – 3

GT – motion passes

***(f) Approval for JCSU Enterprise payments for Garden Party & Freshers' Gowns***

ASh – hoping this is not much of a contention, it is just a formality. Excess of £500 needs to go through such a meeting. Can't wait until next OGM to pay for Garden part and gowns for fresher's

DE – seconds

GT – no opposition, motion carries

**5. Emergency motions**

n/a

**6. Any other business**

n/a