

Chair: Rhiannon Ogden Jones  
Secretary: Emily Simpson  
Returning Officer: Hannah Taylor

1. Report from the JCR President

---

2. Reports / Questions to Officers

---

3. Reading from the Poet Laureate

---

4. Ratifications from Previous Meetings

---

5. Constitutional Amendments

---

6. Motions of No Confidence

---

7. Charities Motions

---

8. Monetary Motions

### **Extra pizza for the extra meeting**

This JCR notes:

1. This is an extraordinary meeting not budgeted for in the Treasurer's meeting budget

This JCR believes:

1. Members should not be hungry

This JCR resolves:

1. To increase the budget for meetings for this term from £300 to £350 to buy pizza for this meeting .

Proposed: Ben Lakeland

Seconded:Grassam

SFQ: none

Debate:

Flo: enough money?

Ben: Yes

Ben - amendment

Seconded Grassam; amendment – increase to 75

Do we have to buy it from dominos?

Yes

Motion passes – overwhelming majority

---

## 9. Motions as submitted

### **Motion to allow dual Presidency:**

#### **This JCR notes:**

1. The role of JCR President is stressful and can have a negative impact on the life of the person who takes on the role.
2. Recently Ben Wilson and Arthur Morris put themselves forward to run for the role of JCR President together.
3. After some deliberation, it was decided by the Executive Committee that it is not possible for two people to run for JCR President together. The reasons for this decision were as follows:
  - a. The Constitution makes no explicit reference to a dual presidency.
  - b. Joint campaigns have previously not been allowed.
  - c. The constitution refers to ‘the President’ rather than ‘the Presidents’.
4. Despite this decision, there is nothing in the constitution which explicitly forbids two people running for a JCR position together.
5. It states in Part I, section 5, clause IV of the Constitution that ‘The JCR may overturn the interpretation of the Executive Committee by a Procedural Motion (as established in section 13) with a two-thirds majority vote’.

#### **This JCR believes:**

1. Two heads are better than one.
2. This pressure put on the President could be reduced by allowing two people to share the responsibilities associated with the job.
3. Since the Constitution is not clear on the matter, the issue of whether or not a dual candidacy should be allowed is a matter of interpretation of the document.

#### **This JCR resolves:**

1. To overturn the decision of the Executive Committee.
2. To allow up to two people to run together for the position of President, on the condition that they provide details of how they will share the job between them before the election.

Proposed: Ben Wilson

Seconded: Arthur Morris

### **SFQ:**

Will: what exactly is the plan?

Arthur: we feel that for us the constitution does allow enough scope to allow for two people to run. As long as the standing orders are still met.

Ben: we feel we can't do it alone but together we can.

Arthur: it does say any jcr member can run, it doesn't say they can't run simultaneously. We don't want it to be about us running, you can vote for this motion but vote against us later.

Will: the question was what is the two of yours' concrete plan?

Ben: to be announced at husts not here.

### **Debate:**

Hannah: How I see this suggestion of having two presidents is similar to creating a whole new role. As in sub dividing the role of president. E.g how we created the trans rep as a separate role to LGBTQ+ Rep. So I feel the same thing for two pres, we would need to just create a new role and go through constitution, this is my interpretation based on the most similar scenarios in the past. So for two presidents to run we'd need a change to the constitution which cant happen in time.

Sam: isn't it the splitting of a role though not producing two new roles?

Hannah: I feel like that's for you to decide, I felt the analogy was close but you can decide to overturn my view.

Secret ballot - Lakeland

Seconded Ryan Salter

Emily: Reads email from Millie - see appendix for full message.

Rhi: not all of that is relevant to the motion at hand.

Will: Having two presidents will increase paperwork, bureaucracy, things college will have to deal with. You will have to communicate this to college, uni and maybe else where, as it will make things more complicated. There's so many little things that will add up together which will make it difficult and I don't know if you have thought through it.

Rhi: Point of Order - scope of debate should be to overturn the exec on whether we should allow for this to happen, if the constitution allows for it. Whether you think the dual presidency should happen is a separate debate, this is just about if constitutionally it should be allowed.

Will: so many problems, like if one wants to resign, if we want to RON one. I think there's so many things that needs to be changed and we would need to go through further constitutional change for this to happen. Why is it worth it?

Arthur: this is about whether or not the constitution should allow it and everything holds up if you look into it.

Ben L: point of information: we have framework for how to deal with RONing one person in a group etc as we already have committees

Rhi: those are committees so that's what allows the scope for that.

AGR: the constitution doesn't explicitly say we can't have two presidents?

Helen: I don't come often, I don't understand everything but I think it is important to send a message that people are welcome to run to the younger undergrads. We should send a message that anyone can run. I don't understand how the constitution will fall apart but I think as the JCR body we should be inclusive and welcome everyone running.

Ben: I agree with Helen. In terms of what Will said I think we will explain what you asked at husts and I don't think this is the place.

Florence: I think if we are going to let two presidents run. I think there needs to be more constitutional support for that. Because right now I don't think the constitution could stand up if problems came up in future.

Julia: I think it is one thing changing the constitution, but there is the legal significance if we were to interpret it as dual presidency. If we start considering interpretation rather than what the words say, we could go down a dangerous route as we shouldn't start changing what the constitution is through different interpretations of it in the future.

Colette: Can I talk about this being a constitution amendment. In agreement with Julia, it requires a lot of heavy reading for it to suggest the constitution allows two presidents. There may be a need for a constitutional amendment if we want it to allow two pres. One pres at another college, said about delegation, maybe we should discuss a different infrastructure, Pres, vp and sec.

Ben W: the lack of a secretarial role is a problem in this college.

Will: we have a sec it's the vp.

Flo: the president can delegate for others to attend meetings.

Rhi: yes like Grassam goes to academics committee.

Shiv: I think the email Rhi sent round this morning opens up more issues

Colette: people don't know who you are

Shiv: I'm the ex president. Colette raised some point - when it comes to talking about work load - it is tough. You can get lots of crazy things come up out of no where to deal with. I think it is manageable as one person. I think you need to remember delegation. You don't need to sacrifice your degree for this. If we start having more than one for president, then you'll need to allow for more than one person for other roles. College will not appreciate a dual presidency, it is not something they would like. With regards to the email - I do think this is a job one person can do and I think it should be a one person job.

Arthur: I think that should be decided by an election and not whether the constitution allows it. I do think it allows it.

Shiv: I do understand what this motion is but the motion and whether we should have dual presidency isn't separate.

Tara: just because one person can do it doesn't mean it would be better for one person rather than two. We could just see if two people can perform better and see if they would do well and if not just don't elect again. If the role is done well by two people then I don't see why we cant try. All I see is mainly humanity students taking on this role just because it fits in better to their degrees than for scientists and I think it's unfair to basically lose half the talent in college because they can't fit it in their daily structures. The kind of people who engage in the JCR are the same kind and I'd like to broaden it.

Rhi: point of info - there are a mix of presidents sci and humanities across uni

Seb: if we pass this tonight but we don't change the constitution at a later date for this to work, can every action that the president does be classed as invalid as they are elected unconstitutionally.

Hannah: I think if we say the constitution says it is possible to have two presidents, then the two presidents will be elected constitutionally.

Julia: maybe we shouldn't be considering it now at an emergency meeting but giving it time to think about it and look further into the constitution. You are having to justify your interpretation.

AGR: I was the first to work in coalition in my role as Medical Sciences Divisional Rep and it did work in theory and in practice.

Colette: I think we should use this meeting to discuss more than just this motion because if it doesn't happen now, when will it be raised. Surely now is a good time to discuss division of labour correctly.

Ben W: can I make a constitutional amendment –

Rhi: You cant bind the future constitution.

Rhi: In response to Colette I will be sending out a new constitution so that will get a chance to discuss this issue further when scrutinizing that.

BenL: There has always been a discrepancy as to when nomination has closed - it has been closed Monday evening before husts. But constitution says 2 days before voting at sunset, there is no sunset exactly 2 days before voting opens at 8am. So I propose for at the deadline of sign ups to be extended in line with Sunset on Tuesday.

Hannah: Yes sunset 2 days before the voting opens. If you want to change my opinion I suggest you propose a procedural motion.

BenL:

Propose procedural motion: to have election sign ups to end 2 days before election. This will give us time.

Seconded by Arthur

Ben L: This is so we can debate for more than 20 minutes before elections close.

Rhi: I would like to rule that due to the incredibly unual circumstances. We will remove the time constraints based on this meeting but I propose upon the finishing of this meeting the nominations will be open for 2 more hours due to the unusual circumstances of tonight.

Colette: when can we debate the division of labour within the committee?

Rhi: we can discuss this on Sunday for the first time.

Sam: As Tara mentions, there is a question of equity about whether science students can end up running for president. Is the pres at other colleges termly?

Rhi: no

Sam: the power of the president vary between colleges and we don't have pres vp, sec here. Just because other colleges can have scientists, maybe Corpus has a problem with this.

Will: I am a scientist and I'm running and so is Ben and Arthur.

Tyron: can I ask we move to vote.

Hannah: we would need to go through procedurals.

Rhi: I think we should carry on debating as we extended the time.

Shiv: I agree with what you said, I am in favour of the ROs reading of the constitution that it is one pres.

Helen: there is still a time pressure because we would need two meetings to make a constitutional amendment. If the jcr believes that two people should run, we shouldn't be caught up in technicalities of the constitution to not allow this to happen. I feel if you think two presidents should run this should be passed.

*Break...*

Tara: this is a question for Hannah, when we say the infrastructure of the constitution can't cope with the dual presidency, what does that mean?

Hannah: under section 3 - that the constitution will guide the governance, the standing orders aren't clear enough for the dual presidency, in terms of distribution of labour. There is no provision in the constitution in favour of dual presidency. Like what if they disagree, who gets the ruling. The constitution isn't clear enough to guide this.

Melina: on technical grounds, if we can interpret the constitution that more than one can run it means that more than two could run and that any of the roles could have extra people taking office. This ruling could open up to all these interpretations and weaken the constitution.

Rhi: rereads the motion

Arthur: it does open it up for other roles to have more than one but is this bad. It means if the jcr votes for wanting say 3 entz pres then we can. If we want it to happen then it could happen.

Ben: point of info: in the future we can make a constitutional amendment to make sure no other roles can have multiple officers. We can put in a clause specifying only one.

Colette: in light of the email today- very explicitly opened up whether or not a dual presidency is a good idea. So because the email started this dialog I think we should have this discussion here. I don't know if it is a good idea but I think the discussion should be had.

Flo: I think we should have a wider discussion but we are voting on this motion not whether dual presidency is a good idea.

Colette: I don't think it is a good place to leave the meeting on if we don't discuss the email and have that discussion here.

Rhi; the first two parts of my reply was just constitutional. 3<sup>rd</sup> part was me trying to get the scope of what the jcr president is.

I am more than happy to have that discussion. I overstepped the mark on this. Wasn't clear on the second part of the motion until earlier. Would respectfully ask that anything in the second half of the email is discarded in regards this meeting.

Colette: I was just saying that because of the email we opened up this discussion already today

Rhi: I construed that the motion was wider than it was when I wrote that email.

Arjun: the constitution does not necessarily read we can't have more than one. We don't want to start going down the route of because the constitution doesn't explicitly say, or not say something we allow it to be interpreted as possible. We should change things that the VP is involved more and the standing orders of the President is divided and VP is there to support.

Arthur: we have to interpret the constitution as there is no provision for it.

Arjun: There is it says president (singular).

Will: Helen brought up that she doesn't think a technically like the constitution shouldn't stop people from running. But the constitution is the founding work of the JCR and it should be followed.

Arthur: it says to promote the interests of it's members.

Will: it sets a really dangerous precedent is we start bending for constitution for the greater good. I think the way this has been done is reckless.

Ben W: why is it reckless?

Will: this goes back to Tara, she said we should just see what happens. Whats the worst that could happen but this is a dangerous way to go about things. I think people have exploited the jcr positions in the past.

Rhi: we are still looking into it. Also I don't think that is really relevant.

Will: it still stands that this is a reckless way to go about things. People in here are under the impression having two presidents is not that a big deal.

Ryan: section 6 clause 8 says if both pres or vp can't minute...- it says both which implies they are two people not more than two.

Sam: couldn't both refer to positions.

Ryan: It sounds like both people not both positions.

Rhi: I'll take these last few points



Flo: the constitution needs more work if we are going to interpret as two people. If we are going to start twisting these things. We would need to discuss how to deal with things like presidents disagreeing as the constitution can't deal with this stuff as it stands. I feel like we need to deal for this with more framework to put in place and draft standing orders and make constitutional change in future

Helen: are we not able to say if they were to run

*Rhi explains a very long and convoluted way in which we'd call more emergency motions etc to make constitutional amendments and essentially it sounds like the process is too long and not realistic to have any useful consequence prior to the elections closing.*

Helen: what we have established is that as it stands these two people want to run and they can't but the purpose of the constitution is to represent our views.

Rhi: reads the name and purpose of the constitution.

*Hannah reads: preamble of the constitution. 3.1*

Helen: this constitution is a document that supports standing orders which supports us. We should be able to vote in agreement of what we want to say as a jcr.

Flo: there is a procedure for constitutional change

Helen: we don't need constitutional change, we are caught up in technicalities and I think it's unfair that the jcr can't support you because of the fabric of the constitution.

Liv: if we pass this today so it allowed them to run and they win and then we want to pass in future to get rid of this and have a constitutional amendment to change delegation of power what would happen

Hannah: I think any motion brought forward would have to explain what we want to do in the future and how to deal with the current situation.

Tara: I don't think that is specific to dual presidency anyway. Could abolish a different role and have to put in place a plan for its change.

Will: if we do pass this motion and decide we do want two presidents, the college would be really unhappy.

Rhi; point of order: under the 1994 Educational act that the JCR constitution is subject to approval by the governing body. So we have to go via GB as they ensure our existence so they would have to allow this to pass.

Arthur: just because they don't like it doesn't mean it can't happen

Will: if this makes college unhappy and they are in control of the constitution as Rhi just said...

George - Point of information: is Will breaking purdah by saying he is criticizing the dual presidency?

Rhi: no one here is using their position to influence who should run. There are no dual presidency running atm. This is all being discussed in the hypothetical.

Hannah: under the constitution there are two ways you could count abstentions. How I interpret it is that if you all abstain but 2 people are for and 1 against the motion passes. I can't read into abstentions. But there is something else, if there are more abstentions then for then the motion fails but I currently read it as regardless of abstentions if for are double against then they pass. Is everyone happy with my decision if not we'd have to go through further procedural motion to change this.

*Everyone agree - Secret ballot:*

61 votes: 7 abstentions, 34 votes in favour, 20 votes against  
Motion fails

---

## 10. Emergency Motions

---

## 11. Any other Business

Nominations are still open for 2 more hours

Hannah: can bring the discussion on whether the President has too much work back via proposing constitutional motions to change standing orders etc.

Liv: where's the bench?

Rhi: bench should be back, I just can't carry it.

Appendix:  
Millies email:

I'd like to clear up this most childish proposition by proposing my own refined and mature account of how this might be more appropriately put into play. Notably as a sort of last resort.

I set out by first referring to a glaring (certainly to me at least) error in the current voting system: the manner in which one might vote RON. Let us suppose that two seemingly (to some) inadequate candidates are contesting presidency; it is imaginable - in fact I argue \*most\* plausible - that some arbitrary member of the voting population might prefer (however strongly - suppose most strongly

to highlight the strength of this argument) one candidate over the other, yet still hold that neither candidate is fit or desired for the job. Now our voter is at a crossroads here as to whether they ought to vote RON or their preferred candidate less their opponent gets in. This, I argue, gives this voter an unfair representation. Why? Well, because the choice is a difficult one in which they must take a blind chance, or a guess at the voting population or else make the choice entirely arbitrarily. The problem arises clearly in the result of the voting. Say there are many such people as our voter considered, crude statistics will tell us that votes will be evenly split between RON and the preferred candidate, A, such that the unwanted candidate, B, might get the majority! When it really ought to have been the case that the other candidate did or else RON; that is if the majority of the voting population wanted RON, and/or as our voter did RON \*or\* A. It could be argued that the voters that wanted RON or B would even this out but in practice this is simply not so! It cannot be so. We do not know the minds of our voting population nor the context so cannot know what distribution of preferences we have - ours is not a statistically idealised system as imagine by this postulated balancing. It is not likely this balance is not met. Even if it were (incredibly unlikely) each torn individual is making a somewhat arbitrary decision which may lend to an unwanted skew or saturation of opposing outcomes st a minority gets through.

I hope this is clear. I'm not the best at clarity.

So my proposition, 1: permit those disgruntled voters to vote for a candidate and have an additional vote in favour of RON should they wish. Hence people have the choice to vote for just one candidate, one candidate and RON, or no candidate and RON.

This naturally leads to my proposal for how dual presidency might be incorporated of the system. In the case that RON has majority, I believe this should open a short window for new nominees - 24 hours - after which should none step forward dual presidency ought be the default between the two most successful candidates in the first round of voting. (See here the importance of my proposal 1 - people who voted for RON now two have had their voices heard in the selection of these two best candidates whereas under the current system they would have been deprived a vote).

The idea of having couples run for president is utterly ridiculous. It opens the floor to people getting through who aren't up for it or even who have no intention of contributing to it. Poor candidates might get through on the back of their better friend and the voters will have to accept that unwantingly. Additionally this makes is an uneven floor for singular candidates. Aside from this the president should be fully willing, aware and committed to the work and responsibilities of the role - a pair need not have this worry. This undermines the true sense of a president.

I really would like to see my proposals forwarded at this meeting. I do hope you agree they are simple fixes to the current biased system and a good closure to this idiotic discourse on dual presidency.

Kindest regards,

Amelia (Millie)