



# Governance Committee Meeting – 22-02-2021

## (with correspondance for 2.2 Elections)

Attendance: BT (JCR Chair), AW (SRO), SWC (President), MP (VP), JC (JRO), MR (JRO)

Location: Zoom and the GovComm Group Chat

\*meeting begins with AW admiring MP's vest\*

\*It's agreed that no one with a Facebook frame endorsing an SU election candidate should post about the SU election in Cuth's groups\*

## Motions

### Covid Fund motion

JC Confused about the bit about running a new motion, seems unnecessary

AW It could have implications with FiComm, if it's under 500 pounds they will ask about it.

JC I think if they take that out they have more control

MW removes this line

SWC I will second it as this was in fact my idea.

\*No further governance issues\*

### Terms of Office SOs update

MP What exactly is written on a motion of no confidence?

BT It's basically a normal motion. Quite simple. EMa (President 19-20) proposed last time, so SWC can now.

AW Think it's fairer that a sabbatical officer does it as it's a bit of a telling off

JC It needs to explicitly say that it requires no seconder

AW It already does – but perhaps we could make it clearer.

\*No further governance issues\*



## AutoVONCs (Automatic Votes of No Confidence)

From the minutes, MP has 9 people due to be auto-VONC'd. Some of these people later claim to have attended meetings they are marked as absent for and are removed. MP decides to repeat at least 5 times in the meeting that attendance will be sorted via a google form and that this will be put on the bottom of every page of the agenda

SWC AJ (Local Students Rep) has been active – he doesn't really know how the JCR works. To be fair I have messaged him saying he needs to attend more.

MP I feel like we shouldn't be auto-VONCing minority reps that we aren't in the groups of – I just think it's not a great look. Same time though, it doesn't feel fair to let people off for being minority reps, but punish people who have in fact better attendance.

SWC AD (Trans & NB Rep) & AJ were added late to the communities group chat – maybe communication with them has been poor, perhaps it's not their fault.

JC I was originally on MP's side when we discussed this last year – but if minority reps aren't attending they aren't properly representing their groups (by the logic of the standing orders). Maybe none of us are part of the group, but that doesn't mean that they shouldn't be held accountable.

AW I struggle to see why we shouldn't run these. It requires a 2/3 majority to pass. They run like normal motions – we can be against it.

JC For minority reps, it could be that just people in their groups can vote?

SWC We could ask for it in a motion – but we can't enforce it anyway. We don't want to out anyone who voted. I don't think we'll do it here.

MP I'm against running autoVONCs for minority reps

AW We could have a procedural motion to table the motions

MP Not everyone here has been useless in their position

JC They only need to persuade a 3<sup>rd</sup> of the people, I don't think it's that bad

AW To avoid a very lengthy naming and shaming – I say we table the discussion.

SWC I do think auto-VONCing 9 people in a pandemic is a really bad look

MP I just feel no good is coming from this

AW There aren't good justification to not doing it from a governance perspective.

BT I'm not opposed to a procedural motion.

AW In fairness we will have JUST discussed the TOO standing order – people will have this stuff on their minds.

AW I say we propose a procedural motion – postpone these motions until July (when they would serve no purpose anyway)

SWC Just table these specific ones, these people can still be autoVONC'd in the future.



AW Someone should explain why they have been brought, and what the rules are

MP says he will write the motions, doesn't, and AW ends up writing these motions and sending to SWC, who proposes them, and then proposes a procedural motion in the JCR meeting, which passes.

## Elections

BT offers to share screen to show video husts

JC MS teams can share the file – it'll come straight from MS that can send uncompressed video. I can compress it.

MP We should run this through an MS teams call today or tomorrow.

We do, and it turns out pretty good in the meeting

### JGa Senior Welfare Officer

\*No governance issues\*

### JW Sports & Societies Chair

\*No governance issues\*

### NT Publicity & Relations Officer

\*No governance issues\*

### LH Publicity & Relations Officer

\*No governance issues\*

Warning given for a campaign team member posting manifestos of opposition candidates 2 hours after the candidates she supported

### EMS Outreach Chair

AJ I'm confused by 'Auction off the JCR'

\*Most present are unsure what she means by this\*

SWC It sounds like she will sell the JCR to the highest bidder – maybe ask that she clarifies



AW I'm inclined to say auction off the JCR is fine – it's not benefitting. It's only going to hurt her if it is confusing

SWC I think we should ask her to clarify. We've definitely asked people to clarify in the past.

\*Consensus to ask EMS to clarify what is meant by 'Auction off the JCR'\*

SWC I am not sure about some of her intersectionality stuff – some of what she is suggesting is really not within Outreach Chair's remit – things like discussions on male suicide and depression. I have an issue with this.

AW In the Standing Orders Outreach chair's description is really short – this doesn't come under it.

BT Some of this could be considered as raising awareness, which is allowed.

SWC But some goes beyond – for example her "Let's Talk about it Tuesday". I wouldn't necessarily even be comfortable with Welfare doing this stuff, let alone Outreach.

MP DASH did raise awareness – it can be a little disingenuous to simply raise money for an issue without bringing up why the issue exists.

SWC I think that's different as DASH is a trained charity – lots of this shouldn't be Outreach – there are lines between Outreach and welfare within the JCR – people can feel uncomfortable if something they've experienced becomes a charity case.

AW Is this a Governance issue? The more SWC argues the more I am convinced. In the material things are tacked onto the role. EMS can talk about responsibilities she would add if elected.

SWC She can still encourage intersectionality in Outreach that is good – broaden it etc. but I am a bit worried about "Women Wednesdays" being something that shouldn't be organised by Outreach.

JC I originally interpreted this as a volunteering project for the wider community.

AW I didn't see it as that.

AW EMS's system on minority quotas would require a motion to pass for her to do it.

MP AW ran on reforming elections, that isn't actually in the SRO's job, so she should be allowed to say discussions will be had.

AW Yup

SWC My two major issues are that Outreach committee doesn't have the training necessary to handle welfare issues, and that some of her material blurs the line between what outreach is and things that are covered by welfare committee/communities committee.

BT & AW agree that this goes far enough to be a Governance Issue, MP unsure

SWC I think it's unfair for her to say this, as it's giving her an advantage when it's not something the Outreach chair could/should do.



JC Additionally, the Trustees are strongly against anyone without sufficient training having significant Welfare responsibilities.

AW I think we need to make it clear that if we judge that she has broken the rules here it could require a significant rework of her material relatively soon before the meeting.

MP I feel like if we think she's significantly broken the rules that could be required – this isn't the same as in the last week GovComm Meeting when we agreed that AW made some very slight dubious claims that we didn't like but ultimately didn't enforce.

JC The governance issues are 1) the blurring of the lines with existing committees and 2) organising things which Outreach is not suitable for.

SWC I want this to be explained in words that makes it clear that the JCR isn't anti-sectionality – just that internally some things shouldn't be mixed.

Vote is held on whether EMS should be asked to remove or substantially reword any campaign material that blurs the lines between Outreach and other Committees

\*Vote passes\*

Vote is held on whether EMS should be asked to remove or substantially reword any campaign material that goes beyond the remit of Outreach and would require training.

\*Vote passes\*

AW will contact EMS to tell her she has to resolve these issues.

SWC Please tell EMS that I am willing to discuss this further. But I'm not at liberty to override the vote we just had.

EMS later drops out

\*No further governance issues\*

\*SWC Leaves, offers some old stash for the raffle\*

## CL Outreach Chair

AW Prior to this meeting I asked her not to amend materials so as to not mention LB (Outreach Chair) by name

MP She doesn't say her name or her role on the summary

\*this seems to be technically allowed\*

\*No further governance issues\*



## IC Finance & Compliance Officer

AW Participation fund – he should say he will lobby for. I’ll ask him to change this

JC Increasing Participation Fund using reserves – this is a technically dubious claim but very minor.

JC Some stuff about society treasurers is inaccurate.

AW Had thought that this might be an issue.

JC If he were to drop a quarter of a sentence it would be fine. “by making them foot the initial cost of the things their society needs” – if this comes out I’m completely happy

AW I suppose we can do that. In fairness he did raise this with me – I did tell him that bits were dubious – this is on him.

MP “JCR awards with a monetary prize” – what exactly does this mean

AW I think he means if you are a successful in a field you can get money to fund personal development.

\*No further governance issues\*

\*No governance issues with AL (proposer)’s hust\*



## AF Finance & Compliance Officer

AW Manifesto has neither signature nor crest. My bad for missing this.

BT I don't like him referring to the JCR as a corporate entity.

AW Technically that isn't wrong

MP "Disabilities Reps" – not what they are called and maybe not PC is it ok?

AW I think it's ok.

\*No further governance issues\*

JR's hust

AJ Could the conversation he mentions be seen as precampaigning? If you have a discussion?

BT JR brought it up to AF so I think it's ok

JC I think it's reasonable to allow this

AW I am overall not over the moon with how many people seem to know he is running, but we have no explicit evidence of pre-campaigning, so we won't take action.

Campaign team member adds a profile frame that includes another Cuth's member, decided that she is no longer allowed to make public social media posts.

Warning given for a campaign team member posting manifestos of opposition candidates 2 hours after the candidates she supported

Decided that an instagram story that is mostly text and has a gif is acceptable campaigning

AF requests to have an observer at the results, a rarity.

## TB Facilities

\*No Governance issues\*

## EM Chair

MP Does he have a poster?

AW It's the same as his manifesto

\*No Governance issues\*



## Social Chair

AW Social chair was advertised on materials for Freshers' groups and SS put up a Cuth's needs you frame, but wasn't included in the JCR meeting header. As no one ran for it this time, this isn't a major issue.

## Running the meeting

BT It'll be a long meeting won't it?

BT For the raffle we will do a tankard and stash.

AW Greggs again?

All Greggs again.

AJ I think we should make it clear who won last time out

AW I'll do an IG story

\*JC goes off on a tangent about the exact logo used on election materials. Even for me it's a bit GovComm, so I decide it isn't worth minuting\*