

## DULWICH SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

### CONSTITUTION WORKING GROUP

#### MEETING 4 April 2011: MINUTES

##### 1. Attendance and apologies

Present: Jeremy Crump (convenor); Chris Burns, Jane Howard, Nikki Jackson, Caroline Annesley

Apologies: Peter Watkins, Frances Barrett, Roland McCabe, and Ian Finn

##### 2. Minutes of the meeting of 14 March

paper: CWG2 minutes

The meeting considered 3 points made by Frances Barrett in an email of 4 April to the members of the WG.<sup>1</sup> They were as follows:

*1) I did not think that the meeting were in a position to agree to make the report available to the whole membership before the committee have read it. In any case the meeting were not asked to agree - the convener just made a comment that he saw no reason why this should not happen.*

*2) I would like the minutes to reflect that as we considered each clause we admitted that we did not actually know what some of the phrases in the clauses actually meant. (See CWG 2 A)*

*3) CWG 2 annex -  
"This table records the decisions ....." etc  
The word "decisions" should be changed as discussions on some of these amendments only took place between a few persons before the convener wrote something down. At no point did he read out what he had written and ask for agreement from the meeting.*

On 1), the other members of the Working group shared the Convenor's recollection that the previous meeting had reached consensus that the report should go to the membership in parallel with the Committee, but that there should be sufficient time for the Committee to discuss the report before any general meeting at which it was for discussion.

On 2) it was agreed that this applied to clause 1, on which Ian's advice had been sought, but it was not the case for other clauses. There would of course be time to take external advice on any amendments if it were thought to be necessary. This is reflected in CWG3/1: Next Steps.

On 3) it was agreed to replace 'decisions' with discussion and actions. It was understood that the outcome of the discussion, as recorded in the table annexed to the minutes, would be reflected in the draft report and should reflect the consensus of the meeting in so far as that was possible. Members had the right to submit minority reports. This is also reflected in CWG3/a.

---

<sup>1</sup> This note was inadvertently not copied to Chris Burns. The Convenor subsequently raised this with Frances Barrett, who confirmed that this had been an unintentional oversight.

The minutes were adopted without amendment, but the new wording of the annex to future sets of minutes (including these) reflects the discussion of the third point.

### **3. Next steps**

Paper CWG3/1

The paper was accepted with one amendment, which related to the commencement of any revised constitution. The revised text (CWG3/1 amended) states that the new constitution will have effect from the day of the next AGM (this of course assumes that it is adopted before the AGM) and that any changes to the process for electing officers and committee members should be in accordance with the new arrangements.

### **4. Substantive consideration of proposals to amend the constitution**

The WG noted the advice submitted by Ian Finn. It was agreed that, in the light of the complexity of this issue, discussion should be held over until the next meeting.

The working group continued line by line consideration of the amendments proposed in the parallel text version of the constitution (CWG2/2).

The group considered amendments J-U, plus amendment X and the proposed deletions from article 7 of the present constitution. A summary of all the actions agreed for inclusion in the draft report and substantive comments made on each amendment is attached in the table in CWG3 Minutes (annex)

### **5. Any other business**

There were no items of other business.

### **6. Date of next meeting**

9 May 2011 and 23 May 2011.