

GM 2 TT25 – 18/05/25

Key

CT = Callum Turnbull

MS = Mukund Soni

EW = Elsa Wester

NN = Natascha Norton

SB = Sarah Blaney

Officers' Reports

Discussion of changing the constitution regarding GM quorum (EW – Treasurer).

EW – considering amending the Constitution so that we need 35 people in person for quorum to be reached (currently need 35 on Element).

ZL – confirms what this means.

Liv – nothing will ever get passed if this happens, we will never be giving money to plays.

Felicity – not necessarily people being against it, but just can't be bothered to come in person.

Toby – supportive.

Angharad – often people don't come also because they are busy, especially from Jowett, easier to vote online whereas much more effort to come in person.

EW – 200 people living on mainsite, they should still come if they do care enough. Otherwise that says something about the motions, should we really be giving out money?

Dom – another issue may be we have GMs too often.

CT – reason for having one today after last week is that we have quite a lot of pressing topics, or ones that were submitted after deadline. Next one won't be until Week 7.

Madeleine – very useful to be able to vote online if you are busy, but can still contribute to voting on motions.

EW – nothing to stop people also joining online, just ensuring we have enough people in person too.

Liv – maybe need greater incentive to arrive in person.

CT – incentive could be we just will not have GMs if quorum is not reached. Money will not be distributed.

Toby – agrees that last GM was farcical, element might be good for voting, but discussion needs to occur in person. Have you asked other presidents about how they do it?

CT – will do at future Prescom. Catz has GMs for discussion, and voting online via Microsoft forms. Thinks this is terrible for engagement in GMs. MCR has in person quorum, vote via show of hands, people can join on Teams. Often don't reach quorum but then just do not hold GMs.

Toby – believes the latter may be a good idea.

Dom – maybe link attendance to fridge ballot, housing...? Admits it's a bit dystopian.

Not exactly a lot of enthusiasm for this idea, as Dom perhaps expected.

Questions to Officers

None.

Discussion of Motions

Motion: Update the Constitution to Prevent Individuals with a financial conflict of Interest from Voting on motions (CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT)

EW – most charities have a conflict of interest policy, so cannot vote if there is a conflict of interest. Due to the nature of JCR activity, this probably isn't feasible, but we can have a financial conflict of interest policy. So you cannot vote if you will benefit financially from a motion.

Questions:

Avri – how would you determine if something counts as something that you would benefit from?

EW – only if you directly receive money or control an account into which money will be transferred.

Jade – will it be self-reported or decided by other party?

EW – ideally self-reported, but should usually be fairly apparent, a common-sense motion.

Zach – how would you apply this to case of PS5 by BCFC?

EW – this was a shared good, available to all in JCR, so no financial benefit to anyone, all allowed to vote.

Jade – is there a mechanism for excluding someone from voting on Element?

CT – no.

EW – solution could be people coming in and showing that they have not voted on Element?
Or we could switch to another voting system like paper ballot.

Callum – I might be able to see if someone has seen the motion on element.

Dom – would person who can't vote count towards quorum?

EW – if financial conflict of interest, could count as forced abstention towards quorum.

Natascha – can't we change so that proposer should never be able to vote?

EW – sometimes seconder might be treasurer, so they should also not be allowed to vote.
Also if something benefits lots of people financially (e.g., stipend for multiple people), then they should all not be able to vote.

Points of support or debate:

Tobi – really think it's a good idea in principle, just about implementing it well in practice.

Passes 26-5 (4 abstain). Needed 60%, will need to be brought in again at next GM to pass through as it is a constitutional amendment.

Motion: One-time payment of £200 to support student production of Crocodile Tears

NN: asking for £200 towards original production that she has come up with, money going towards a good quality projector that they need for the play, will be £150, rest allocated to other production costs. Very keen on getting freshers involved, lead actress is a fresher, hoping to create original theatre.

Points of support and debate.

AT: Support.

Passes 33-1 (1 abstention).

Motion: Buy picnic blankets for JCR usage

EW – asking for up to £100 to allocate to buy blankets for JCR. To be kept at Plodge and then booked by JCR members like airbeds.

MS – how big will they be?

EW – still deciding, may put a poll up if motion goes through.

Jade – what if someone returns them in nasty condition?

EW – will be charged on Battels as a result.

Points of support or debate.

MS – back it.

Passes 33-1 (1 abstention).

Motion: Public Statement on Supreme Court Decision Regarding Transgender Rights

SB – wants to put out a post on JCR insta to clarify JCR’s position on Supreme Court decision in relation to transgender rights. Reads out public statement.

Points of support and debate.

Avri – could this be amended to include intersex people?

MS – unfortunately, current rules do not allow for this. Amendments must be submitted by end of day Saturday before a GM. Reason is to avoid confusion over exact wording if amendments allowed during GMs.

CT – in future, feel free to submit amendments in advance, even if friendly.

Dom – does the order of motions at the next GM matter (asking in relation to financial conflict of interest motion and ability of certain members to vote)?

CT – no, even if motion passes, not implemented until Dylan (IT Officer) updates Constitution.

MS – also note it wouldn’t apply here, no financial conflict of interest.

EW – unless Sarah and Mark have been paid to write this public statement, which I doubt...

Passes 31-1 (3 abstentions).

GM adjourned.