

JCR COMMITTEE MEETING 18/02/2024

AGENDA

President's business -

Vice President's Business -

- How to implement welfare reps amendment
- Wording of EO and access role combination

General -

- Visiting students budget

RESOLUTIONS

How to implement the welfare reps amendment - conclusion will be made in an extra meeting in Monday w6

Wording of EO and access combination - will add subtitles separating the roles so it's clearer what each of the individual roles are

Visiting student's budget - 35 pounds a term

GENERAL

President's Business -

Vice President's Business -

How to implement welfare reps amendment -

- Krishh: We are adding another welfare rep, can Ruby or Daisy discuss what we discussed on the executive committee whatsapp chat
- Daisy: how do we run elections if there are 3 - do we run as a group of 3 or individually? Daisy and Luca have discussed this, they think running individually would work a lot better than three together because there are a few colleges that do this (Brasenose) the way they do it is effective but it's extra work - they will run one candidate first, because of the genders thing - they will say the next person that runs needs to be of a different gender and the final one is a free for all
 - Ruby: asks for a copy of the Brasenose constitution
 - Daisy: a lot of individuals want to run but they don't know who to run with, this will give them an opportunity to run by themselves. It's also good if you are not friends with the person you run with. From previous years and other welfare reps if you are really close friends there is potential of falling out easily. If you run individually you are more likely to get a spread of people across the college rather than one group of people, this also opens up the space for genderqueer people making it more inclusive. Thinks the gender split is a little inaccessible as it says they need to be different genders but is still quite a binary outlook on how welfare is run. The con is running one at a time might seem a bit more effort, this might be worth it in the long run. The issue with 3 as a group, once you get to 3 it's a friendship group, how comfortable will people be in approaching 3 people when they are friends, they know each other quite well etc. Also if we got rid of the gender thing, if 3 run together and they are all female or all identify with being a women, as we have two freshers running that are both women - who is going to be the men's officer? The idea is that there is one woman, one man for welfare and the man takes up movement and men's officer
- Sara: You could do a pair plus one more. The other suggestion is for SU elections you have a quota, a certain number have to partially or wholly identify with womanhood, could do 2 and the third one is someone who just gets first place in their gender
 - Gaspard: just have a ranking with SU presidential thing, rank the welfare reps in order of preference. The first one gets the role, then the highest ranking different gender gets the role, then it goes back to the next role. Think it is important that everyone runs at the same time otherwise people will do strategies.
 - Krishh: doesn't think it should be run at different times
 - Daisy: doesn't think different terms, but would happen close together, as in one after another. The issue with one as a pair and then another is what we will do this year as there needs to

be three. This would lead to a pair and a third wheel whereas we want three equals

- Gaspard: this year we have to do this but next year
- Krishh: this year it should be 2 people
- Daisy: no, disagree, we are dying
- Ruby: we can do 3 people, but this term we have to do 2 people because we can't not do what's in the constitution
- Daisy: going forward individually would work better
- Ruby: the other thing is we can't run one in trinity
- Amy: we can push it forward, exec is w3 with one welfare, then one welfare w5 then one w7
- Daisy: would benefit from third person
- Sara: gender quotas is the best without having separate elections
 - Daisy: with the quota type thing, this would mean that we are only filling a quota and we are not actually getting the people that are voted top
 - Sara: they are the people that are voted top - first person, as the gender doesn't matter, then the next person of the next gender, and then the next person
 - Gaspard: means potentially if there are 5 women running and one man running and the man comes last he would still get it
 - Daisy: or do we get rid of the gender thing?
 - Gaspard: who is the men's rep then
 - Ruby: could we do it you run for the specific one so female gender rep and then do open gender rep
 - Gaspard: People will do strategies and run for open cuz their friend is going for a specific gender
 - Krishh: not onboard with the ranking system
 - Sara: that is how the voting works
 - Krishh: but the last person of a gender, if no one votes for them just because they ran they get it
 - Gaspard: if you have a man, a women and open you have 5 people running for women, one for man, just because there is one person running for man they would win, the problem is the same
- Shalina: could have men's rep as a separate role like women's rep
 - Daisy: still have 3 welfare reps but then have women's rep and men's rep
 - Ruby: So add 2 more roles? not a good idea
 - Daisy: not adding another role with welfare
 - Ruby: no we are
 - Daisy: no it's not a new role, it's another person, why is that an issue?
 - Ruby: the committee is getting too big
 - Daisy: why? we have to represent 400 people
 - Gaspard: men are already represented with a male welfare rep, it's not a representation issue
 - Daisy: what happens if we get rid of the gender divide with welfare and no men end up being it, wouldn't want there just to be a quota filled, want the best candidates following on from them
- Sara: what is their job? The womens rep does socials or sanitary reps, what does the men's rep do?
 - Gaspard: can movemeber be a charity rep thing
 - Daisy: would have to do the peer support training which college

pay for, end up with something like 4 welfare reps, would be fine but its the training which is 3 hours a week, currently women's rep is not welfare

- Gaspard: we could change it
- Sara: We want gender balance, so men or women get represented. Having one election with only one male candidate is the same as separate elections with only one male candidate. If you see the list and there is only one male candidate and he sucks then you would ask more people to run, more of a problem with people not running for elections than the system itself
 - Krishh: if there is a RON option, what happens if someone gets less than the RON?
 - Sara: if someone comes last it means RON has come higher
 - Krishh: RON is in the ranking?
 - Shalina: do you get 3 votes?
 - Gaspard: 3 votes or a ranking
 - Sara: you have to rank, let's say there are 7 candidates and ones RON, if you like 2 or 3 and no more you put RON above them and if someone gets less than RON than someone can't get it - lets say its a man and he sucks
 - Krishh: this is not an issue for this year its ok
- Krishh: are we in agreement in what we are thinking, to have 3 welfare reps and not have them labelled as anything but we have to fulfil a certain quota as the first person in the ranking gets it and then the second person of a specific gender... the first one is open, the second one is a different gender, the third one is a different gender to the second
 - Sara: If it's the opposite gender, yeah but don't think that's an issue, they can partially identify as women or men. First candidate doesn't matter of the gender
 - Krishh: if the first and second are already different genders then the third person will get it
 - Daisy: in the constitution they just gave to be different genders, it doesn't matter specifically
 - Gaspard: can someone partially identify as male or female, then they would cheat the system?
 - Shalina: if there is also the issue of someone who is gender neutral and someone female identifying then there is two different genders but there still isn't a man
 - Sara: that's why partially identifying counts
 - Ruby: add another clause, add at least whole or partially identifying as male or female
 - Daisy: surely this issue would be resolved if we just had male and female reps and then 3 welfare reps, it suddenly gets complicated if we rank people and we fill quotas. If you have your first lot and you pick the top person or you pick the top person that was ranked then the second and the third person should get it as well regardless of who they identify as that's how it should work and that might mean not fulfilling a quota
 - Sara: people who might be great welfare officers and win, can't run now
 - Daisy: why? This is what I am challenging, I understand this and agree. We now have 2 freshers that want to run and they are both female
 - Gaspard: if you look at the constitution they can't run

- Daisy: we have had no other communications from other peoples that are running
- Gaspard: you can't decide you don't like something in the constitution and just ignore it
- Daisy: but it makes it difficult to run
- Ruby: if anything this makes it easier, we have one election - might well be a boy in the year below that wants to run
- Daisy: this is why individually would work, if we go on how many votes someone gets its theoretically how many work, one two three should work
- Luca: surely, say you have your top three women and then man, he is 4th surely it makes more sense to do 1, 2 and 4, rather than jumping
- Sara: no it wouldn't be jumping
- Krishh: two top ranked and then after that fulfilling someone from a different gender, and if the two are already different genders then its the next one
- Luca: if someone agender runs then its someone agender and two women then its fine?
- Krishh: it's not perfect but its the fairest system we can do
- Sara: it's less democratic but...
- Ruby: only marginally, other institutions use this system
- Daisy: the only thing is that the people who are voted in are voted in by us as a JCR, let's say they are all female or identify as a woman, they have been voted in because people want them in, we can't see who's voted for who they have been voted in
- Shalina: we could have it so we have two welfare roles, and one welfare and men's role - two separate things in the constitution, so people individually run for welfare and another person as a separate thing
 - Krishh: this is the same thing as two people running and one person going separately
 - Luca: or 3 men could go for welfare
- Krishh: I get your reservations daisy, there is also a certain gender balance that needs to be ensured and representation within the welfare team, feels like it's the fairest system
 - Daisy: if we had on the equalities mens and womens, why would the welfare be an issue
 - Ruby: because the current's women's officer wouldn't be a welfare officer, men's rep would be too small of a role to justify it being created
 - Gaspar: charities rep could just appoint someone for november, because that's all it is
 - Luca: this is all I have done as men's rep, maybe I am meant to be doing more?
 - Shalina: Is there other stuff with other men's reps?
 - Daisy: there should be more stuff, but it's hard when luca is a full time welfare officer
 - Krishh: we need gender balance in welfare team, if someone feels more comfortable approaching someone of the same gender on the welfare team that works
 - Gaspard: if we had a man that got sexually assaulted, and there are 3 female welfare reps then that's a problem
- Daisy: worry is if there are 3 top candidates and they got voted in, it's

unfair for them to be not be voted in

- Sara: The question is more would you rather there be 3 candidates but a large number of people feel unable to talk about their issues, or the person who got the most votes. Or would you rather the election got a quota, same as if it was run in separate elections for a men's role and you can RON the man, you pick the candidates you want most
- Daisy: I do get that, but I would feel really wronged if it turns out there were 2 female candidates, I was third and I didn't get it just because the 4th person was a man
- Ruby: same as if you were to run for female officer and you came third then you lost, you haven't been wronged you just lost
- Gaspard: worse if you did the male female separate elections. If you have men, women and open, if you are the second women then you still get more votes than the first ..
- Sara: if there are 3 people running men's, a guy comes second in mens' he got more votes than all the women and he is not elected. Just because people picked the wrong election to run in they are not elected even if they got the most votes
- Daisy: don't think doing it in a men, women other is good
- Krishh: It's not the third person exactly, the person lost the election but there is a third person who is satisfying a particular requirement of the role then. If RON comes above that person then that person...
- Shalina: what Daisy is trying to say if people have voted in the top 3 people then they would be comfortable, men are still voting this election, if men are still voting 3 women top, if men felt they needed a man they would have voted them in
 - Ruby: It's a generally known thing we need gender difference, could have been one person who voted for nonbinary people because they wanted that, could have had more women voting in elections. Seems undemocratic in fitting a quota, its also more democratic because it allows more people to be seen outside of an election, it's not about who won an election,
 - Daisy: surely that's the people who are voted
 - Ruby: if they are the top three, it's not going to go down well if we have taken quota out of the constitution
 - Gaspard: better to have someone slightly less competent but you would go to them than someone who is competent that you wouldn't go to
- Krishh: go back to Sara's point that its a balance between either would you want representation on the welfare team or would you want the top 3 people to get it even if they are all of the same gender, it's the welfare team's decision: it's your call to make its up to you guys
 - Ruby: it would need to pass as a motion first, do you want to do it as a motion or save it for trinity? Or not be able to run a welfare rep for the coming elections
 - Gaspard; they are separate issues, we need to create another role for welfare
 - Luca: the pair running this term has to be male female
 - Daisy: what if no one else runs?
 - Ruby: then we have to run it again
 - Daisy: so if it's just those two girls, is this not allowed?
 - Krishh: it's not allowed,

- Luca: so in this case can they run, so the next one has to be male
 - Ruby: no, we need to act on what we have now. This needs to go through now, if we want there to be 3 welfare reps this needs to go through council which is happening this week and the governing body and if that doesn't happen...
 - Gaspard: everyone agrees on a 3rd welfare rep, that was put through and that passed
 - Amy: just figuring out how to write it in the constitution
 - Gaspard: we need to turn up to council with a plan of how to write it, do we not need that through a motion? Motion agreed on the concept
 - Krishh: can go through as a motion, proper wording to be added to the constitution for next year
 - Gaspard: we voted on the idea but we didn't vote on the phrasing
 - Krishh: the practicalities need to be sorted
 - Gaspard: we want a third welfare rep that does the same thing. Would have to be separate elections, this is what we are voting on now
 - Krishh: at least bring changes to the constitution next term
 - Gaspard: we have to have people run as two this term as we want three, but we need to vote on the phrasing on the third welfare rep. We need a proper motion for this year, if this is a matter of phrasing, the third one we don't care about gender
 - Krishh: what are we adding to the constitution right now, what is the motion going through? We just copy paste the welfare section
 - Ruby: should be a third welfare officer, if we try and do this right now it won't be done, it needs to go through council which is this week, and then governing body which is w8, the constitution will not be changed otherwise... We can scrap welfare elections this term and then run it in trinity but then it will be run in. going to council this week about it, know this is the plan. Resolution: to not run welfare this term? If we desperately want to change the constitution, then we don't run this term
 - Gaspard: how would you feel about two run this term and the one run next term as a one off?
 - Daisy: yeah that's fine
 - Ruby: cleaner if we do one in next term
 - Daisy: especially if these two
 - Krishh: is the question whether we want different genders on the welfare team or whether we want the top
 - Ruby: we have to have different genders on the welfare team, if we don't we will be slandered, no college does this
 - Luca: there are colleges that have welfare rep of all the same genders
 - Gaspard: with no men and women's rep? And then what do the men's rep do and they have to go through the welfare training
 - Daisy: mens rep and women's rep are equalities, there are men's issues that should be addressed
 - Gaspard: need to be addressed by men's rep that is trained...
- conclusion will be come to in a meeting on Monday w6

Wording of EO and access role combination -

- Krishh: Essentially combining the positions under both roles, a couple

of pointers modified outdated wording, also mentioned the thing about inward and outward facing and combining roles. Can Sara and Isabella look over it now

- Sara: likes the focus on inward and outward - asks if we can section off the area that used to be access and the area that used to be equal opportunities so people can see the two different parts of the role so it's not one big text
- Isabella: just add some subtitles
- Sara: not a big change just labels
- Isabella: likes the name and changes
- Krishh: this doesn't need to be an amendment, when writing the constitution we will put in different headers and the points will be the same

General -

Visiting students budget -

- Mitchell: can I have 35 pounds a term?
- Gaspard: yep I think that's possible