

## GM 3 MT25 – 30/11/25

### Key

CT = Callum Turnbull

MS = Mukund Soni

TF = Theo Fischer

LE = Lara Ulkeroglu

AP = Avrah Pernica

JB = Jade Bennett

KH = Keira Heslop

GF = Gilon Fox

### Officers' Reports

Quorum is reached.

### Charity Raffle

TF – Thanks so much to everyone who participated – we have raised £79.50 for the Woodland Trust.

LE – First winner is Alex Evans. Not present to collect.

TF – Second winner is Daniel Lamb. Not present to collect.

CT – Third winner is Connor Mair. Present to collect. *But only gets one prize, not three sadly.*

### Discussion on June Jamboree

CT – Held in June, has budget of around £5,500. Everything free but drinks – food, drinks stand, activities like bouncy castle, games etc. Fun vibes, free party, not usually very well attended. Wanted to use this to hear what people thought about the June Jamboree, no vote today.

Keira – does this include cancelling this year's one?

CT – yes.

Cassie – Isn't this also for college staff etc.?

CT – College has said that we can decide whether to run it or not. Our choice how to allocate JCR finances.

Lucas – Is it exclusively JCR funded?

CT – yes.

Phoebe – wants to make clear that we can still give funding to Garden Party without cancelling June Jamboree. We can also change its form – ideas of bringing it earlier, doing it on mainsite last year – just didn't happen as there wasn't enough time for College to do risk assessment etc.

Lucas – if we cancel it this year can we bring it back next year?

CT – yes, would just have to be budgeted for.

Toby – good idea to do it, move it earlier so better attended.

Henry – good idea to cancel it as it is poorly attended due to timing. And JCR has limited funding for other areas as a result, could allocate more to Garden Party etc.

Reuben – how was attendance pre-Covid?

CT – current format has only been in place since Covid. Been poorly attended every year.

Toby – some positives with idea of having a free event or party for JCR. Even if we change its format, principle of a free event run by JCR for JCR is still good.

Cassie – what else could money be used for?

CT – anything, up to Treasurer.

Eli – would college let us use this money to fund ball or garden party?

CT – yes, college is happy for us to use funding as we see fit. Elsa has made it clear that we can fund ball or garden party without needing to cancel this.

Vin – if it's in 9<sup>th</sup> week, is it worth preponing it to 7<sup>th</sup> week?

CT – yep, could do so.

Bella – it's quite sparse, not really worth it given how much money it takes up, could be used better elsewhere.

Avrah – I don't know if it is worth it for the amount of money it is. But nice to have a free JCR event for JCR students. We can prepone it and change its format a bit.

Cassie – nice to do something that staff are invited to and to do something for them.

Jade – will it really be possible to move it to main site given exams in Trinity?

CT – last year was proposed, College said because of insufficient notice, couldn't properly do a risk assessment. But not that it isn't feasible at all, just a matter of notice.

Shawn – do any staff turn up to the event?

CT – not really.

Keira – nice event, could reduce the cost a bit but wouldn't change it much. Nice because as it's on the field you can do some sports. Don't necessarily need all the stands. Doing it in 9<sup>th</sup> week is nice as it's after exams, so not too close to garden party or ball.

Toby – best value for money is probably ice cream truck. We could even do more than one event, spread it over a bit more. E.g., just ice cream truck and drinks stand and sports going on once, and then ice cream truck again later.

CT – will propose this as a motion for next GM. Thought it was worth discussing it beforehand.

Henry – what would vote need to be?

CT – 75% as it would change Standing Orders and Standing Policy.

### Questions to Officers

None.

### Discussion of motions

Motion: Formalize Housing Priority in the JCR Constitution (CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT)

AP – already passed at last event, but needs to pass twice as a constitutional amendment. There will be an accommodation ballot soon for next year's accom. Currently, not formalized how this is done, so we want to constitutionalize this so that you can be secure knowing that priority won't change when you make your decisions on housing.

JB – if it doesn't pass now, will need to reintroduce next term and pass twice.

AP – typically in JCR housing officers get a lot of abuse because people think that things are unfair. So if this does not pass and people think the way we do it is unfair, this was your chance to change that.

Short factual questions.

Dom – how is process going with moving things over to college?

AP – yes, that's why we are doing this. Keeley wants it in the constitution before she touches it. This year will be an interim year for transition, from next year, Keeley will do everything except actual video calls for allocation as she doesn't have time for that.

Mia – what would the new process look like?

JB – formalising priority from last year. Explains this [You can find it on the motion].

Points of support and debate.

Harry – last year didn't go well. Definitely worth giving it to college as last year was bad.

CT – factually, this is more of a formality, have voted on this idea last Trinity, just constitutionalising otherwise will be longer to give it to college and chaotic.

Reuben – one of the most stressful things about ballot was just the priority. If formalised, would decrease a lot of stress.

Jade – worth noting that this will also improve implementation as college has data on previous years so don't need to go off people's word on how they have previously balloted (this affects priority).

Passes in second consecutive GM 35-1 (75% needed as constitutional amendment). JCR Constitution is thus amended.

Motion: Allow students suspended for non-disciplinary reasons on college grounds during suspension

KH – filling in for Isobel’s motion. Isobel is the Suspended Students Officer. Reads out a statement provided by Isobel:

For those unaware of the motion, I’m seeking JCR support to petition college to change the rules surrounding suspended students’ exclusion from college grounds during suspension.

As it stands, suspended students are banned from college grounds unless they seek permission from the Academic Progress Committee. I and many others feel this is an unnecessary and exclusionary policy that is largely unjustifiable since most other colleges have no such ban. I am only seeking to change the policy for students suspended for non-disciplinary reasons, as rusticated students can understandably pose a risk to the College community, and exclusion from grounds is part of the punishment. So why ‘punish’ students suspending on medical, mental health, welfare or bereavement grounds?

Because of this policy, many suspended students harbour negative feelings towards college and their reintegration post-suspension is impeded. One student felt too intimidated to buy a ticket to the college ball one year, an event all college students should feel not only comfortable but eager to attend. That’s only one example out of too many. We should not deny any student access to social support structures and familiarity with the academic environment in which they conduct their studies. I’m sure we all agree every student deserves to feel comfortable in college. Therefore, we need to work to decrease the social stigma around the process of suspension and help the most vulnerable members of our JCR to feel welcome in college. Overturning this policy would go a long way to doing that.

KH – happy to try and answer some questions, attended GM last year when a similar motion was discussed.

CT – wanted to add that, contrary to the statement, this is actually normal policy for other colleges.

Harry – what happens if this motion passes?

CT – if this passes, it allows JCR committee to go to college and say this is the JCR position. But college can still say no.

Reuben – has college given reasons for saying no in the past?

CT – they have said that students with welfare concerns are often a danger to themselves but can also be distracting to other students as they are not trained to handle this sort of situation.

KH – Isobel raised this at the last time we had this motion, the language of calling people a distraction is something that is really harmful, needs to be changed.

Bella – will it be done case by case or blanket?

CT – most likely, students suspended voluntarily for welfare reasons might be allowed to come to college grounds more freely. But would be a negotiation, cannot say what outcome would be.

KH – Isobel only wants this policy for non-disciplinary reasons, not all students.

Shawn – is suspension a catch-all term for any reason to not be in college, such as rustication?

CT – they are interchangeable. Similar to rustication, though he personally sees suspension as disciplinary, rustication as voluntary.

KH – issue with language, want to change that. But college uses word suspension more.

Harry – if college says outright we are not changing policy, can we at least change the language?

CT – yes we can discuss that as part of discussion.

Point of support and debate.

Gilon – sees college's view on rustication for mental health concerns, has found that with friends going through hard times, it can take a toll on students who are trying to support them.

Not saying that he doesn't support people coming back, but doesn't see this going anywhere as college does have a point, perhaps for good reason. Would be better not to spend time and resources on this.

KH – suspended students rep is a JCR role, so we can have that conversation without it taking up time from other things.

Avrah – point of support, tricky thing is that suspended grounds have less ability to come too college than members of public. Lots of people might have welfare concerns who are in college, e.g., friends from other unis, so specifically banning suspended students is a concern.

Harry – aren't they still allowed to come back if they do get it signed off?

CT – they have to send an email to the Dean to ask for permission to be here at a specific time and day with some purpose, and mostly rejected.

Jade – point of support. Main issue is blanket ban, really problematic. Default should be you can come back, and if there are welfare concerns on a case-by-case support, then can ban them.

Eli – point of support. Really bad that current policy is so punitive for people who are struggling.

Keira – lot of focus thus far has been on mental health. But there may also be people with physical health and no welfare concerns at all in lots of cases.

Passes 35-1.

#### Motion: Funding for "Hedda Gabler" Production

GF – ended yesterday with a play in the Pilch, Balliol-owned theatre, still needs to pay the Pilch. Has just about broke even with tickets, but around £150 (or a bit more) still needed so don't have to pay out-of-pocket.

Vin – how many members of cast were Balliol?

GF – 3 members, a quarter of cast.

Points of support and debate.

Henry/Bella – went, great play, lots of fun.

Passes 34-1.

GM adjourned and a round of applause for Callum, who is chairing a GM for the last time as JCR President.