

## GM 1 HT24 – 26/01/25

Treasurer has reported that we have enough money to cover all motions.

In the future, if you have a spending motion below £50, please contact Elsa, we'll vote on them at committee meetings.

### Officers' Reports

None

### Questions to Officers

None

### Discussion of Housing Ballot

Housing Officers give a summary of housing ballot. Note that this is the way that it has historically been ran.

#### **Questions:**

What if people with different characteristics ballot together? A – 75% of group needed to have a characteristic for that to be counted in priority.

When will we find out new set of priorities? A – ASAP, depends on how much change is desired.

Why do people on main site waiting list get priority on Jowett? A – historically, this was aimed to ensure later years got a decent outcome.

Does college guarantee enough rooms? A – yep, flexible on this, always have option of staying in college-owned accommodation if that's what you want to do.

Can you provide lists of randomised, and then with priority rankings, because it's confusing how priorities are applied sometimes? A – can be done, will try to ensure transparency as far as possible with priority application.

Difference between people with 3- and 4-year course? A – two options, can focus on year group (so 3<sup>rd</sup> as a group, 4<sup>th</sup> etc.) or on whether it is your final year or not. Note that STEM students who are doing 4-year courses might register as finalists for 3-year courses, then change this later and be dishonest.

#### **Points:**

Amerleen provides a point of support on Vasil and Oli being hard-working.

Issue with giving 3<sup>rd</sup> years more priority is it reduces priority for 4<sup>th</sup> years.

Issue of larger groups sometimes getting split up if below smaller groups in ballot.

Issue of 3<sup>rd</sup> year STEM students feeling they got hard done by compared to Humanities as they are not finalists.

STEM students on 4-year courses should be able to say whether they want to be prioritised for 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> year.

Changing system now means that current 3<sup>rd</sup> year STEM will be hard done by, being low on priority multiple years in a row.

No way to ensure that future years will follow any rules we change now.

## Discussion of Motions

### Motion: Grant to support student production of Closer

Natascha explains motion – wants £250 for Closer play, production costs are £1300, will be in Pilch.

No questions. No points of support or debate.

Needs 60% vote (over £200), passes 35-0.

### Motion: Earlier Submission Date for Motions involving Public Statements by the JCR (CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT)

Mukund explains motion – want earlier submission date to ensure people have enough time to propose any amendments and properly read through motion.

No questions. No points of support or debate.

Passes 32-2 (needed 75% majority, will need to come at next GM too).

### Motion: Amend the Role of the Ethnic Minorities Officer to Ethnic and Faith Minority Officer (CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT)

Nikita gives a brief summary, explains aim to include representation of faith minorities and enhance welfare role.

No questions.

Key points of debate

- Who counts as a faith minority?
- Role shouldn't be combined with ethnic minorities – many religious minorities that are not also ethnic minorities
- Not possible to represent all faith groups in the same way that it is to represent all ethnic groups – very different experiences of being Christian, Muslim, Hindu etc.

Key points of support (more of these than points of debate)

- People last year noted that they didn't have anyone specific to go to regarding religious issues
- Other colleges often combine these roles
- Will never cover full range of experience, only general one – other places in Oxford for specific issues
- Having an advocate even if not representation is worth having

Response from Nikita (proposer)

- Not defining what a minority faith is – all are welcome to be represented
- EMO role aims for welfare rather than representation (BAME exists for that)
- Agrees that perhaps we should have an exclusive minority faith officer – perhaps this could serve as a trial

Closing argument against – there are good arguments for, ideally would just like to see this split into two roles.

Closing argument for – good to add representation of faith. Not perfect, but open to changing this.

Question – would there be a condition to ensure that at least one member of the EFMOs would include a faith minority? For now, both must be ethnic minorities, excludes white faith minorities.

Proposers accept this, change will have to be made in the future, oversight on their part.

Passes 30-5 (needed 75% majority, will need to come at next GM too).

#### Motion: Grant to support student production of Jekyll & Hyde

Tristan summarises motion, big show. Cameron also part of it. Will go towards production costs, subsidising prices. Wants £150.

No questions, points of support or debate.

Passes 34-1.

#### Funding for a production of The Critic

Hugh and Cameron in the play, Hugh presenting. Asking for £200, will help with budgeting.

No questions. No points of support or debate.

[Callum is informed by Amerleen that if people have seen it they count as abstaining and thus quorum can be reached even if less than 35 actually vote – a revelation.]

Passes 33-0 (3 abstain).

#### Funding for Oxford Fashion Society

Flo and Aamani introduce motion, Fashion Society events actively enjoy good attendance from Balliol, accessible events.

No questions. No points of support or debate.

Passes 34-0 (1 abstains).