TRINITY HALL ASSOCIATION
97th ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING: 22nd September 2012
Held in the Lecture Theatre, Trinity Hall, at 6:30 p.m.

MINUTES

In the Chair: Dr Nigel Chancellor, President

1. Some twenty one members were in attendance. At the commencement of the meeting the assembled members stood in silence in memory of Dennis Avery.

   Apologies had been received from Mr Martin Ansley-Young, Mr Andrew Burr, Mr David Lock, Mr Michael Womack and Ms Juliet Day.

2. The minutes of the 96th Annual General Meeting held on 24th September 2011, having been circulated, were duly approved and signed by the President. There were no matters arising.

3. Election of President: at this stage the Vice President temporarily assumed the chair and proposed the re-election of Dr Nigel Chancellor as President. His proposal was seconded by Mr Richard Wright and Dr Chancellor was elected nem con.

   At this juncture Dr Chancellor re-assumed the chair.

4. Election of Committee Members: the President outlined the qualifications of Mr David Lock (2006) and Dr Andrew Lennon (1999) and proposed them for membership of the Committee. The proposal was seconded by Mr Bob Ely and Mr David Lock and Mr Andrew Lennon were elected nem con.

5. Secretary’s Report: the Secretary spoke briefly to the main points of his report which had been published on the College web-site. There were no questions.

6. In the absence of the Financial Officer the Secretary spoke briefly to the Statement of Account for the year ending June 2012 which had been circulated prior to the start of the meeting. Income from the endowment had grown from £9,375 to £11,937 as investments returns have improved. The underlying value of the endowment had grown by around 7% to £362,274 over the year. There was a small surplus on the year’s activities – this being a ‘non London’ year. The actual surplus of £2,483 was greater than expected due to one of the THA awards not being taken up, it would otherwise have been £1,483. The secretary moved that the accounts be adopted, they were approved nem con.

   The Vice President paid tribute to our exceedingly able Financial Officer.
7. The President spoke of the tremendous contribution that Dennis Avery had made to the Association at a critical point in its existence. Mr Barry Lewis proposed the resolution:

That the members of the Trinity Hall Association wish to put on record their immense gratitude for the vision, fellowship and generosity of Dennis Avery in re-invigorating and endowing the Association.

The resolution was seconded by Mr Bob Ely and was passed nem con.

8. Event Subsidy Policy: in introducing the item the President commented on the increasing pattern of events and that at least twelve year groups had had reunions in the course of the previous six months.

The Secretary moved the motion:

That the Association will continue to subsidise events for the membership as a whole and, in addition:

(a) Fund the reception prior to the MA dinner.

(b) Subsidise ticket prices for all THA events to those within ten years of matriculation

The motion was carried nem con.

9. Any Other Business:

(i) Mr Barry Lewis proposed that the Association should send its warmest thoughts and condolences to Mrs Sally Wong Avery. The proposal was very warmly received and was carried nem con.

He reinforced the President’s words on the important role that Dennis had played in re-inventing and invigorating the Association at a critical juncture in its existence and suggested that we should look for a tangible way to keep alive the memory of Dennis’s legacy to the Association, perhaps by an annual award.

He encouraged members to submit their ideas to the Secretary by email (chris.angus@btinternet.com).

He then passed to the Secretary a copy of the book of tributes to Dennis for inclusion in the records of the Association [note: this may also be viewed on the College website].

(ii) The President reported that the officers of the Association had received an email from [REDACTED] listing a number of concerns about the administrative processes of the Association, the conduct of its officers and alleging breaches of the Data Protection Act. The Secretary read out [REDACTED] email to the meeting, of which the following is a key extract:
Would you please raise at the AGM that there has been a problem with the application of the Data Protection Act by the officers of the committee, and that there have been breaches of it and possibly also of the Computer Misuse Act ...\(^1\)

As the whole membership is the Data Controller, members should be aware of this and also the fact that there has been other concerning behaviour, including:

i) the circulation of my emails to personal contacts without my knowledge or permission and interception of emails clearly addressed to the committee so that you say they have seen nothing of my concerns;

ii) my failed efforts to contact the committee using their official email address and no evidence that they made any decision to allow 'procedural enquiries' to be dealt with by certain persons;

iii) the appearance of the committee not being democratically run and not making the decisions;

iv) misinformation given to me about the constitution and the College's website policies being relevant to THA members;

v) the incorrect advice that the THA does not have an email presence (i.e. email address) and that it is exempt from the DPA;

vi) failure to answer my legitimate member enquiries or justify what I have been told which I know to be untrue;

vii) no one telling me that Sarah Webbe was no longer a committee member when it was clear that I was contacting her in the belief that she was, and the ongoing failure to note this in the latest Milestones.

viii) by implication of the above, breaches of the CASE Statement of Ethics.

When I have time tomorrow, I will examine these issues further, but I hereby request you to raise them at the AGM so that members can decide what to do about them, given that the committee acts always subject to the wishes of members.

These are all matters of College welfare because they affect the reputation of the College.

The President then gave the meeting some background to the email. He explained that since his election as President in September 2011 he had received a regular stream of requests from [REDACTED] for clarification of the procedures and management processes being practised by the committee and officers of the Association. At an early stage in this extended dialogue, the President as Chairman of the Committee asked the Committee that authority be given to the officers to respond to any request addressed to the committee concerning the management processes of the Association to ensure a quick and efficient response to such requests; this authority was given at the meeting of the committee on 12th February 2012. Not satisfied with the explanations she was receiving [REDACTED] initiated a series of complaints about the processes of the Association including alleged breaches of the Data Protection Act. In answering [REDACTED] complaints,

\(^1\) A short section of the email at this point has been redacted as it includes a purported statement from a University official that we have been advised that for legal reasons that person could not and would not have made.
the officers had been at pains to point out that the administration of the Association was practised strictly in accordance with its recently ratified constitution. In addition, advice concerning the Association’s status under the Data Protection Act, and its obligations under the Freedom of Information Act had been taken from the Information Commissioner’s Office, the University Office for Intercollegiate Services, and Trinity Hall’s Freedom of Information Officer all of whom confirmed the Association’s status as described to [REDACTED]. Notwithstanding, [REDACTED] has continued to dispute these opinions, and to complain against the officers of the Association ignoring or disputing their detailed responses while questioning their ethics and probity.

The President then asked the members present if they had any concerns about the way that the Association was being managed by the officers and Committee. No concerns were raised by any member present.

Mr Barry Lewis proposed a vote of confidence in the officers and Committee. This was seconded by Mr Martin Williams and was carried nem con.

10. There being no further business, the President closed the meeting at 7:00 p.m.
Note

These minutes were signed by the President at the 2013 Annual General Meeting as a true record of the proceedings of the 2012 Annual General Meeting. The draft minutes were placed on the College website several days after the meeting and [REDACTED] was informed of the outcome of the meeting and that the minutes were available. On 6th March 2013 we received a letter from [REDACTED] asking us “to correct facts” about her in the minutes (see below). On receipt of the communication the Officers carefully considered the points raised and responded that, with the exception of an inconsequential error in the date of a Committee meeting we stood by the statements contained in the minutes (we did make one inconsequential amendment to the data of a committee meeting). In September 2013 we received a letter from the ICO (Information Commissioner’s Office) stating that they had received a complaint from [REDACTED] to the effect that ‘the 2012 AGM minutes contain “incorrect facts” in contravention of the fourth data protection principle which states that “personal information shall be accurate and up to date”’. The Secretary has responded robustly to the ICO that we believe that the minutes and statements recorded in them are factually correct. The ICO, having considered our response to them, have stated “In this case we have decided that it is likely that the Trinity Hall Association (THA) has complied with the requirements of the DPA” and “we do not recommend that THA need take any further action in relation to this particular matter”.

The letter, attached to the email of 6th March 2013 and addressed to ‘committee members of the THA’, make reference to ‘incorrect facts in the AGM minutes’ as follows:

1. “The AGM minutes state that I sent a stream of emails to the Chairman ‘since he became president in Sept 2011’. I can find no emails I sent him in 2011, so could you provide these?”

As [REDACTED] indicates the minutes say ‘since … September 2011’ not ‘during 2011’. The emails that the President refers to have been sent since September 2011.

2. “The date of the meeting on 9th February could be wrong as there was no dialogue with him until April 2012, e.g. I sent two emails to the committee in February 2012 without response for five weeks and an email to the Chairman in March which received no response.”

The date of the meeting should have been stated as 12th February – this will be corrected before the minutes are adopted but would hardly seem to be a substantive cause for concern.

3. “The AGM minutes state that the officers were authorised at that meeting to ‘answer management questions to ensure a quick and efficient response’. I was given a different reason, so could you provide evidence of what was actually authorised and on which date?”

Whatever reason [REDACTED] may think she was given the minute is an accurate record of what was stated by the President which was an accurate statement of what was agreed by the Committee.

4. “The AGM minutes state that I initiated a series of complaints. This is completely untrue. Please show where I made any complaints. I raised concerns and asked for an investigation.”

Again the minute is an accurate record of what was stated by the President and represents the President’s view of the communications.

5. “The AGM minutes state that I disagreed with the advice the officers took, but I did not receive this advice. I shared advice from the ICO and Jeremy Wilson, who said we were all in agreement, but this and my SAR is missing.”
Again, we stand by what was recorded in the minutes, the Officers relied on advice obtained directly from relevant authorities rather than any secondhand opinions from [REDACTED] based on an inaccurate view of the actual state of affairs.

6. “The AGM minutes state that I ignored detailed responses, but I received no response at all to key questions of management.”

Again, we stand by what was recorded in the minutes. There came a point where it was decided that it was simply counter-productive to respond to [REDACTED] questions in detail since such responses were either ignored or were misconstrued.

7. “The AGM minutes have redacted advice I received from Legal Services with the opinion that the adviser ‘would not and could not have said’ that. This is logically incorrect and only opinion. I have checked that I reported the advice correctly, which was similar to other advice. It was received on 2nd August, 2012 at 9.19 from 01223 764900 for three minutes and is the only advice I have received from them.”

Again, we stand by what was recorded in the minutes. As stated we redacted a short section of [REDACTED] communication on legal advice. It is not clear what [REDACTED] means by “This is logically incorrect and only opinion”.
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