



---

## SRC 2 Minute Template

Tuesday, 20 March 2017

Law Link Lecture Theatre

**Appendix A:** SRC 1 Agenda, including reports and other reference material

### Item 1: Meeting Opens and Apologies

Meeting opens: 6.15pm

Acknowledgement of Country

Apologies received from:

- Sammy Woodforde
- Lewis Pope
- Ellie Dowling
- Emma Boyd (first half of meeting)
- Tess Hemmings (proxy to Eleanor Kay)

---

### Item 2: Minutes from the Previous Meeting

**Motion:** that the minutes from the previous meeting be accepted.

**Moved:** Harry Feng

**Seconded:** Aji Sana

**Status:** Passed

---

### Item 3: Executive Reports

#### 3.1 President's report (J. Connolly)

- Report taken as read.

#### Questions

Q: With respect to the Memorandum of Understanding, are there areas that are contentious?

A: Realistically, there is one outstanding issue which is an operational matter, prefer to keep confidential. MOU will be needed to be ratified by SRC so there will be an opportunity for questions.

Q: In your report you discuss University Australia, and the priorities for the sector for 2017 engagement with industry, will this continue?

A: In my report, I meant to have said imploration of the federal government. This is a part of

the innovation agenda of the federal government which extends over the education portfolio, in 2017 its not shifting its focus its still interested in engagement with industry.

Q: Could you elaborate on the Student Partnership Agreement?

A: It came out of Scotland, from a thing called sparks; it's a formalised relationship of engagement and consultation with the student body. I will be presenting to SP agreement as a topic to the Academic Board, and hope that recommendations will come from that presentation.

**Motion:** that the President's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Howard Maclean

**Seconded:** Harry Feng

**Status:** Passed

---

### 3.2 Vice President's report (E. Kay)

- Taken as read.
- Some mid-semester exams are being held off campus at the Polish Club in Turner; if you have any questions/concerns about that, get into contact with myself or James.

#### Questions

Q: Are there going to be shuttle buses?

A: Taken on notice.

A (Matthew Faltras): Marnie said yes, there will be.

Q: Regarding the structure of the Mental Health Committee, why the move from Co-Chairs to Head and Deputy Chairs?

A: There were some challenges to job share, the reality is that our vision for the committee meant we'd already set big goals, and set that the chair would come on board set in that vision, alongside assisting leadership and such.

Q: Will students have to take the shuttle bus? Under their own transport, is there the same provision for break downs as for bus?

A: Taken on notice. I want to flag that if you find info, or are concerned please get into contact with me.

Q: When you say that the theme of the Mental Health Symposium is contributing to healthier university action plan – is it encouraging students to make submissions?

A: The Mental Health Symposium is being run by the university out of advocacy group; it's an opportunity to have all big stakeholders in one room- the university's long term view is to establish and nut through a healthier action plan for university. The idea is not for students to write submissions but to instead come along. The student leaders on campus, for example, would be great to have there. There will be workshops where we will come to together how to accomplish these.

Q: Following off the previous question regarding MHC structure, is this just for this year or is it a continuous structure?

A: For this year yes, however committees aren't in the constitution so we are not bound by anything, so it'd be something for the future exec to look into. James and I have been looking into formalising/establishing of what it means for ANUSA to have a committee as

there is nothing currently there in the Constitution.

**Motion:** that the Vice President's report be accepted.

**Moved:** James Connolly

**Seconded:** Harry Needham

**Status:** Passed

---

### 3.3 Treasurer's report (H. Feng)

- Report taken as read.

#### Questions

What's the aim of the student association finance committee?

A: Aim to promote more financial governance.

Q: Would you be willing to add more information/details on line items listed in the budget for the next meeting?

R: Yes.

Q: How does the Murrays Deal differ from last year?

R: Not much difference, the ticker price is the lowest offered on the market, make them specifically say its \$30, ILMP is \$37.

**Motion:** that the Treasurer's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Winson Widarto

**Seconded:** Georgia Dee

**Status:** Passed

[The Chair passes to Cam to allow Kat to give his report. Cam's nomination was not subject to dissent]

---

### 3.4 General Secretary's report (K. Reed)

- Report taken as read.
- Safety on Campus committee is under my portfolio.
- Received official resignations from Mish (CAPS rep) and Waheed (CASS rep) – please refer to email or slack message for more information.

#### Questions

Q: Regarding OGM 2, from my understanding the ANUSA executive are no longer employees of the association, is this why these regulations are to be passed?

A: For a response to this, it would be best to go to James.

Q: Regarding the governance reforms on ANUSA, how do you see the departments seeing and implementing internal governance?

A: That's a little bit tricky – broadly speaking departments have autonomy over their institution and constitution, and ANUSA has overarching power. I will approach department officers and help fix their constitutions, if they'd like. I offer myself as someone who has been involved to help with internal reforms – any concerns with clashes w ANUSA constitution, let me know and we can discuss it/I can look into it. I leave autonomy to

departments.

(Follow up) Q: Should we conduct ourselves regarding advocacy and student engagement as individual departments or jointly under ANUSA?

A: Never thought of it about it to be honest, happy to collaborate and set up meetings with other department officers to discuss this.

**Motion:** that the General Secretary's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Matthew Faltnas

**Seconded:** Fred Hanlin

**Status:** Passed

[The Chair passes back Kat not subject to dissent]

---

### 3.5 Education Officer's report (J. Wu) (5mins)

- Report taken as read.
- I'll be able to attend the CASS/CAPS camp, be there by Saturday and that's unfortunate that two reps resigned – safety and wellbeing will be guaranteed at these camps, happy to take questions.

**Motion:** that the Education Officer's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Julia Beard

**Seconded:** Yuka Morinaga

**Status:** Passed

---

### 3.6 Social Officer's report (C. Allan) (5mins)

- Report taken as read

#### Questions

Q: Why is there no motion for the payment of Friday Night Party Directors?

A: Yes, it will be brought up in 'Other Business'.

Q: Why are intra-club relations your focus?

A: Issues within clubs that are quite high stakes; and there is currently no uniform policy for clubs for how they deal with issues that occur internally; grievance policies can differ between clubs and some don't even have one. It'd be really good to have such a policy online as it happened many times this year, and there isn't yet a grievance policy specifically targeting clubs.

**Motion:** that the Social Officer's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Marcus Dahl

**Seconded:** Daniel Fox

**Status:** Passed

---

## Item 4: Department Officer Reports

#### 4.1 Indigenous Department (M. Brinkely) (5mins)

- Report taken as read.
- First coffee catch up, there were about 20 people there, and we're are having another one tomorrow.
- We've started meetings for the NAIDOC week, and we've got some great events that we want to do. The theme is our languages matter, so hoping to have a tailored event about languages too.

#### Questions

Q: Are you happy with the amount of consultation with the university?

A: Every committee has said yes to having a student on their committee, and hopefully will be powerful especially with indigenous studies is in CASS.

**Motion:** that the Indigenous Department Officer's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Arjun Dasani

**Seconded:** Tanika Sibal

**Status:** Passed

---

#### 4.2 Women's Department (H. Zeng) (5mins)

- Report taken as read.
- NOWSA applications have opened. The Organising Committee has sent out emails to campus reps, held on 16<sup>th</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> July, with applications closing 16<sup>th</sup> June.
- I'd like to draw attention to Emma Davies to congratulate her for Women's Week.

**Motion:** that the Women's Department Officer's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Sarah Rajakariar

**Seconded:** Eva Krepsova

**Status:** Passed

---

#### 4.3 Queer\* Department (G. Scott) (5mins)

- Report taken as read.

#### Questions

Q: Your report said that, new venue for coffee was not at street theatre – where will this venue will be, have you considered accessibility?

R: Yes, so we've currently moved to Smith's Alternative, and we have had some accessibility concerns raised so we are looking into it to increase accessibility.

**Motion:** that the Queer\* Department Officer's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Makayla-May

**Seconded:** Felicity

**Status:** Passed

---

#### 4.4 International Students' Department (W. Waldarto) (5mins)

- Report taken as read.
- Office hours Monday 11am-1pm, students welcome to send email to make appointment
- Expenditure on welcoming for ISD officers, \$62.00

**Motion:** that the International Students Department Officer's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Harry F

**Seconded:** Eleanor

**Status:** Passed

---

#### **4.5 Disabilities Department (A. Sana) (5mins)**

- Report taken as read.
- Spoon Week Working Group, please spread it around, please volunteer.
- Call out for Spoon Stories, essentially stories about people's experience living with a disability, if you want to share please do.
- Spoon Gala; we are hosting an event in Spoon Week similar to Friday Night Party, hopefully see a lot of performances and hopefully a fundraiser so please spread that around or let me know if you want to perform.
- Please volunteer, whether you identify or not does not matter, please let me know.

**Motion:** that the Disability Department Officer's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Tom Kesina

**Seconded:** Gabriel Scott

**Status:** Passed

---

#### **4.6 Environment Department (G. Dee and L. Noble) (5mins)**

- Report taken as read.

**Motion:** that the Environment Department Officer's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Lewis Pope

**Seconded:** Nick Sifniotis

**Status:** Passed

---

**Procedural Motion:** that Rashna Farrukh be able to deliver her report.

*(note: Rashna arrived late, invited to deliver her report after arriving)*

Moved: Julia Beard

Seconded: Harry Needham

Status: Passed

---

#### **4.6 Ethnocultural Department (R. Farrukh) (5mins)**

- Report taken as read.
- Ethnocultural Week; just had first meeting with officers -all is going to plan, and it should be really good.

## Questions

Q (Cameron Allan): Regarding the Inter-Faith Festival being the week after Ethnocultural Week, how should we navigate this crossover?

A: I don't think there'll be a lot of cross over, but happy to meet about it.

**Motion:** that the Ethnocultural Department Officer's report be accepted.

**Moved:** Matthew Faltnas

**Seconded:** Emma Boyd

**Status:** Passed

---

**Procedural Motion:** that the meeting be adjourned for 5 minutes to allow for a break.

Moved: Howard Maclean

Seconded: Fred Hanlin

Status: Passed

Meeting adjourned at 6.48pm

Meeting resumed at 6.58pm

---

## Item 5: Discussion Items/Motions on Notice

**Motion 1:** That the ANU Students' Association reaccredit with the National Union of Students for 2017.

Moved: James Connolly

Seconded: Lauren Clifton

Status: Passed

---

### Mover: James Connolly

- I am voting to support to reaccredit with the National Union of Students because we are voting on whether we want membership rights for 2017.
- I speak as former ANUSA Education Officer when saying that effective student advocacy requires collective action; that is the premise of my student unionism.
- For a voice to be heard it must be in solidarity with other students. The NUS is the only body that can facilitate this collective action.
- It has access that we simply don't have, with having met with Education Minister Simon Birmingham and the ability to lobby the crossbench on the Omnibus Bill.
- With the many issues with the NUS raised, a vote against accreditation is effectively a boycott that says we have identified problems but don't want to have a voice or vote in the solution. If you call out problems, you also need to be a part of the solution.
- The accreditation fee proposed is a small amount which I believe is a more effective means of protest that initiates a form of conversation about reform that would see a more meaningful financial contribution in the future all the while gaining membership rights.
- Reasons I'm voting yes: concerning the 2017 officer bearers there are three former campus presidents, they are facilitating the transition to a more accessible website and rectifying issues regarding availability of minutes, and now with a welfare officer one day speaking on ABC Radio Hobart, the next campaigning in Perth.

- Assessing the landscape of 2017; we've already faced penalty rate cuts and Centrelink, the government is considering cutting the program supporting students with a disability. Furthermore, there is still discussion regarding deregulation, and soon the Respect in our Hallways results will be released.
- Every issue requires nation-wide action, and the only body that can facilitate that is the NUS.
- What does the NUS directly provide to us? (1) NUS approached ANUSA to conduct a snap action protest against penalty rate cuts, (2) when they heard I was looking into parking fees they offered to create a petition and offered ANUSA co-branding rights for the campaign, (3) the NUS ATSI Officer took the 'From Little Things, Big Things Grow' Campaign and took it nation-wide, and ANUSA is now being accredited for a national campaign.
- As student representatives, I believe that it is wrong that we consider denying any students representation by the NUS. It is a choice between having a national voice and none at all, between solidarity and going it alone. For all these reasons I believe ANUSA should vote to reaccredit.

### **Secunder: Lauren Clifton**

- I second the motion in support of accrediting with the NUS for 2017.
- I'm not saying that NUS is perfect, I'm well aware that in previous years experiences within the NUS have been less than desirable. However, I believe not enough grounds to remove ANUSA entirely.
- Saying this for a number of reasons; (1) the reforms that have been made from implementation of a more accessible website to establishment of a welfare officer
- Not enough to remove ANUSA entirely highlights the dedication of the current officer bearers seeming to be the standard, (2) it seems counter-intuitive and going against the aims of ANUSA to not reaccredit; as James said, the vote against is essentially a boycott, we won't have a say against and will not have a vote at a national level. We will not have any voting power; why give this up when we have the ability to influence change that we want within the NUS.
- Next, let's consider key aims for this year; James did mention some briefly; in my role as Gen Rep I am focusing on creating a more inclusive residential experience, issues I am tackling around the area of assault including transparent policy surrounding these issues and having a proactive rather than reactive response to these issues; acknowledging that education on sex is on a spectrum for sexist/sexual slurs to sexual assault. Soon the results of the Human Rights Commission Survey will be released, which will be important to our universities.
- We can't achieve all this in our Canberra bubble, we can't achieve them alone; these issues require a response from a national body that needs to facilitate this action.
- Let us not remove ourselves from the collective action. There are issues within the NUS, but the solution is not to boycott. One voice can only go so far but a collection of voices and student unionism can bring about change. Let's be a part of that change.

### **Speakers List**

#### **(F)Harry N**

- I attended National Conference as an observer and as a member of secretariat to National Conference 2016.
- There is a lot of criticism of NUS, from my understanding a driving force behind not reaccrediting last year was national conference and it was believed that we could change these three days by not participating. Yes, there have been occurrences that



I have been extremely uncomfortable with but I want to address this idea of how sitting out will cause any substantial change.

- If you see something that's broken, I try and get in there and try to fix it – if people at the ANU genuinely think that the NUS should be changed then we need a seat at the table.

### **(A)Jessy**

**Procedural Motion:** to extend Jessy's speaking time to 4 minutes.

Moved: Tom Kesina

Status: Passed

- I believe that there are three criteria to satisfy in order to reaccredit: (1) This union is meaningfully accessible to its members where there are opportunities and availabilities for them to understand it, question it, and to participate in what it does (2) being a part of the NUS gives a voice of ANU students (3) we can ensure that the NUS advances equity and the experience of students. I will speak to each of these.
- (1) This is a union that doesn't allow the media to access it in a meaningful way, it didn't allow the office bearer reports to be filmed, this decision was arbitrary however there were no voices in that room against it. This is a union that allowed discriminatory slurs to be yelled over the top of a woman trying to speak about how universities could improve how universities deal with mothers just because she happened to vote liberal. This normalizes that these behaviours are accepted and that compassionate and caring people who I do believe are within the NUS are disempowered against speaking publicly and fighting for change within their factions.
- (2) Imperially, some of the most effective campaigns over the past couple of years have been orchestrated by campus activists; for example, the USYD Women's Department demonstration in their O-week. In my experience as Education Officer, it has been shown that we don't need a national body to coordinate campaigns and to capture the media and public interest. Our campaigns about Centrelink and penalty rates have been reported on, we've been published around 8 times this year and yes this is lower than the NUS but given that we are one campus with not much money and they are a national lobbying body with a larger budget we're doing pretty well.
- (3) The campaigns aren't democratically selected and aren't subject to robust critical analysis, and aren't evaluated through the lens of equity and sustainability. This is shown in the campaigns run this year such as the 'Make Education Free Again' campaign which evoked the language of accessibility an equity however – *reached time*.

### **(F)Dom**

- You'll certainly hear a lot about issues with accountability and transparency, and I would say the vast majority of Office Bearers and those in the ACT Branch agree with the reforms under these areas.
- So why haven't these reforms occurred? The implementation of these structural reforms is restricted by short terms of Office Bearers which is a year term. It takes some extremely motivated Office Bearers to tackle these issues whilst rolling out effective campaigns. I'm confident that the Officer Bearers this year will do this.
- It is important to note that this desire for change comes from pressures within the NUS and forces like ANUSA.
- ANUSA last year had no say in how the NUS was run and without accrediting we will continue to not have a say.

- To address the claim that we don't need the NUS, I don't remember ANUSA office bearers sitting in front senate committee, coordinating mass protests; it's not to say that ANUSA can coordinate campaigns that better the life of students but they are limited to borders of this campus.
- Always interested to see animated
- If you truly consider yourself a progressive and believe in representing student rights then you should vote yes.

**(A) Fred**

- I have had some negative experiences being queer officer, personally distanced themselves from the Queer Department and have been very disrespectful.
- We need to take an obvious look, if we disaccredit this is a message to the NUS about our dissatisfaction. Our decision will affect the way in which other universities vote to reaccredit or not.
- It has not been a good time in a long time.
- I cannot support reaccreditation until something is actually done.

**(F) Con**

- I am going to use my speaking time to respond to key issues identified by Jessy.
- It can go too far with conflating National conference with the NUS as a whole.
- The NUS this year has been very accessible (e.g. Jill, Annika). We have had national demonstrations happening all across the country on many different campuses so of course they're (officer bearers) not going to be available 24/7.
- Regarding amplifying student voices, of course campus representatives do that at the ANU but the NUS helps this process and works alongside it.
- Regarding equitable campaigns: the vast majority of education and welfare campaigns, such as all those about penalty rates typically benefit poorer students so are equitable.

**(A) Howard**

- It is imperative that students have a strong voice to lobby governments, has a voice to keep bodies accountable.
- We are facing increasingly unstable funding and we need a strong national voice; the NUS is not this voice. More than that, systemic and cultural issues make it impossible to be this voice.
- The existence of the NUS is harmful, and its needs to be wound up and replaced with a better body. We should begin to take steps to replace the NUS with something else.
- It is not possible for such a large amount of reform to happen.
- The NUS isn't the only choice, building a new house with, I believe 11 other universities that have decided not to accredit, is more viable than anything else.

**(F) Brianny**

- I was involved last year, as a first year, for a little while at attended National Conference last year.
- I decided to see past the issues and criticisms as the NUS is much bigger than National Conference; so, I've decided to go into the union and demand transparency.
- There is no campaign on this campus that rivals the NUS. The NUS gives us the resources to form snap campaigns, and the NUS is respected and valued in the eyes of federal MPs.

- ANUSA and ANU will be seen as a joke for not accrediting. We must represent students.

**(A)Ben**

- Yes I support activism, but I don't support NUS.
- This year there are slightly different issues, I'm glad people are pushing that it's still broken.
- Regarding talking about boycotting or making change from inside; the only reason changes were made this year was due to not accrediting for 2016. We took the lead to disaccredit alongside other universities, sending a message.
- If we do not accredit this year it sends that message again, the most effective way to make change is to do what is effective action and bring other universities on board, encouraging them to also vote no; doing collective action to do something about the NUS.

**(F)Nick D**

- Thank you for coming out tonight and engaging with the debate.
- Everyone does have a voice, I think they should be able to have a voice, and of course there is a need to have a voice.
- We are a Group of 8 university, why can we not add to the debate?
- I think ANUSA does a lot of great work; at a lobbying level NUS can help ANUSA. To the best of my knowledge, no one on ANUSA has sat on a senate enquiry whereas the NUS has, having the ability to discuss how issues affect students.
- The amount of lobbying power the NUS is quite significant.
- I don't want to see this body fail, I want you to work with me to take reforms to the conference.

**(A)Gabe**

- I am the current Queer Department Officer.
- There were concerns raised when we discussed this within the department.
- The NUS is quite factional and so it is the factions that decide the office bearers; it is not an autonomous process.
- Aside from the arguments of toxicity and lack of communication, the NUS wasn't in much contact with the Queer Department and this year not much has changed.
- The NUS put up campaign-related posters on campus and didn't communicate with me first about doing so.
- They NUS has shifted from using the term Queer to LGBTI as they didn't like the term, however it is exclusionary.
- Met with NUS people a few weeks ago, Queer and Women's get paid at their level, however other's don't get paid similarly.

**(F)Winson**

- The International Student's Department (ISD) has financial support however we consider ourselves a department with limited.
- What we need is the network between government bodies, and the research team (gather research and data, and confidential info not accessible) and the ability to connect us other leaders in other universities which the NUS provides.
- Networking between universities is definitely required; as there exchanging information is crucial for improvements for it to be better.

**(A)Holly**

- My collective voted to bind my vote, so this is not my personal opinion but I am speaking to voice concerns raised in our collective meeting.
- Raised concerns; showed lack of commitment to lack of equity, unequal funding of departments whereas compared to at ANU, we are lucky enough to have an autonomous structure.
- The collective did consider that there were many women who are active within the NUS and praising those efforts and the energy put into that. These women should be congratulated.

**(F) Freya**

- I am speaking not in the capacity as my role as Deputy Women's Officer but my own opinion.
- I am a strong advocate against sexual assault.
- Such a campaign cannot be lead without the NUS, GT specifically accredited NUS with the survey.
- The national organization gains so much more traction with its size, its history, and its legitimacy. It captures media attention and has the ability to sit in front of senate committees.
- The NUS makes campaigns more important and accessible; for example campaigning for sexual assault, the resources, support and networks from women and other women's departments from the NUS is nothing like what and ANUSA officer has been able to offer me.
- With the resources, it saves me having to trawl through research and information that may be triggering as its already proved to me by NUS.
- The NUS provides a national link that no other student union can offer, we must accredit.

**(A) Matthew F**

- I am speaking to clarify a point. On October 21 2014, Cam Wilson and Laura Way appeared in front of senate inquiry into higher education amendment.
- Thus, it is factually incorrect to state that ANUSA has not appeared in front of a senate committee.

*Point of Order (Dom Craddock): We were accredited at the time.*

**(F) Cameron**

**Procedural Motion:** to extend Cameron's speaking time to 4 minutes.

Status: Passed

- Apply different reasoning, and prioritizing different needs, trust your own gut and listen, vote in line with what you think is right.
- I am voting for accrediting.
- The most important consideration and the one I'm compelled by is that is there enough value? Is ANUSA a value that adds to the NUS?
- At first I have been very skeptical, and have seen incompetence.
- Question the perception raised: yes, ANUSA campaigns are effective, being most effective for ANUASA members and the best in ACT.
- When analyzing ANUSA's capacity, we don't have the ability to run sustained targeted campaigns; sustained contributions to meaningful debates comes from the

work of the NUS, we cannot act independent and achieve that on our own, we need a bigger voice.

- [I'm incredibly busy] so I don't have the time as I trawl through emails to be fighting the big fight and mobilizing people on campus as I don't have time; with the NUS there is a dedicated team to do that for us.
- I don't see much merit in a dystopian side union.
- There is symbolic and practical value putting our name to the NUS.
- We give NUS the best chance to do things for us if we accredit.
- If we want to have the most powerful NUS then the best possible chance to have that is to be involved within it.

**(A)Harry F**

- Zero contact made between ISD and NUS when I was ISD President, now as ANUSA Treasurer nothing has changed.
- As a treasurer, I see the money we accredit with as having the potential to instead go to another 10 University Lunch-hours, so for practical value I will vote against.

**(F)Lewis**

- I was extremely doubtful and leaning towards no, however a few areas compelled me to change my mind and vote yes.
- The potential of how harmful this can be to the student voice.
- Cam and Freya analysis' on the topic.
- NUS does have the power to amplify the student voice.
- Whether it is completely irreparable or not, and while I was slightly persuaded by the Treasurer, and Queer Officer's arguments, I have come down on not accrediting being slightly more harmful.
- Furthermore, shortcomings of element of actual harm and lack of good – come down to lack of good, NUS is worthwhile, not bad enough to vote no.

**(F)Tom K**

**Procedural Motion:** to extend Tom's speaking time to 4 minutes.

Status: Passed

Abstentions: Fred Hanlin

- I am currently a Gen Rep, however have been involved in ANUSA for a while, so this is my 3<sup>rd</sup> accreditation debate.
- I am voting in favour of accreditation.
- Last year ANUSA took a stand by disaccrediting, and from that some important changes were made due to taking a stand.
- I don't think an ANU organization can work if its not accountable to students, and has a siege mentality to criticism; that's why we need conditions [attached to our accredited amount].
- Conditions are necessary if we vote yes after having raised concerns. After disaccrediting last year things occurred – Laura Campbell's reforms did that.
- If we attach requirements to our accreditation amount, we can see small changes to meet accountability whilst still have membership – for example, some people have raised natcon is undemocratic – what these conditions would do is Office Bearers to do their job, with things such as posting the last five sets of minutes of national exec meetings.
- Voting yes for accrediting, bit wont in the second motion if conditions aren't attached.
- I will be moving amendments to the motion.

[The Chair passes to Cam to allow Kat to speak against the motion. Cam's nomination was not subject to dissent]

**(A)Kat**

**Procedural Motion:** to extend Tom's speaking time to 4 minutes.

Status: Passed

- Most of my points have been brought up, as an exec member and someone who has been involved, weighing in to this debate upholds my responsibility to the Association.
- It makes much more of a statement to not reaccredit; ultimately, I want improvement and the way to do that is to take another stance until more changes have been made within the NUS.
- I have many disagreements with the NUS; decisions of office bearer positions, not comfortable with any bit of my identity and seeming that some parts are worth less.
- I have serious concerns over governance, need an independent audit review.

[The Chair passes back Kat not subject to dissent]

**(F)Eleanor**

- Last year, I voted no; last year treatment of delegates was deplorable.
- Delegates were not safe, so didn't want to send more students there knowing this information.
- I am impressed by the Office Bearers desires to make changes; if ANUSA is flawed we would ask you to engage and speak to us to help us fix it; so, we must do the same with the NUS.
- Some of the things NUS has changed such as moving National Conference to a larger space and Welfare Officer has been great but there are still issues; to reach the things we desire, we have a duty to go back in, and then potentially next year disaffiliate again if nothing improves.

**Right of Reply (James Connolly)**

- Thank you everyone for a really good debate.
- Dispels that ANUSA takes lead and will encourage other universities to also discredit is not true. This didn't happen at all last year with a single university.
- Disaccrediting again will accomplish nothing, NUS is ANUSA's biggest enemy.
- ANUSA is a strong independent, and we must stand up for student unionism and collective action.

[The Chair passes to Amy in order to conduct the secret ballot. Cam's nomination was subject to dissent]

**Procedural Motion:** that the SRC vote via secret Ballot.

**Moved:** Eleanor Kay

**Seconded:** Emma Boyd

**Status:** Passed

**Procedural Motion:** that the meeting adjourn for 5 minutes.

Status: Passed

Meeting adjourned at: 8.23PM  
Meeting resumed at: 8.36PM

[The Chair passes back Kat not subject to dissent]

*Votes for the Motion: 24 YES, 11 NO, 0 ABSTAIN*

*Votes wished to be noted:*

*For: Harry Needham, Nick Sifniotis*

*Against: Holly Zhang (Women's Officer), Kat Reed (Gen Sec), Frederick Hanlin, Howard Maclean*

---

**Motion 2:** That the ANU Students' Association reaccredit with the National Union of Students for the amount of \$5,000.

Moved: James Connolly

Seconded: Jessy Wu

AMENDMENT PROPOSED FROM THE FLOOR:

"That the ANU Students' Association reaccredit with the National Union of Students for the amount of \$5,000, but the amount is not to be transferred until all of the following conditions are concurrently met. That:

- All National Executive minutes & Office Bearer reports are made available on the NUS website (at least from all of 2016 and the 2017 ones available)
- The 2016 National Conference minutes are made available on the NUS website
- The full audited financial report is made available to member organisations, with the missing two pages from the auditor attached
- National Executive appoints a Returning Officer who is not a current or former member of any NUS faction
- A guide explaining how to NatCon (consistent with Laura Campbell's reforms and the letter sent to the 2016 SRC by the NUS) is created and distributed
- That the current budget of the NUS, once approved, be published on the NUS website"

Mover: Tom Kesina

Secunder: Howard Maclean

Status: Passed

*Votes Noted:* Against Holly Zhang, Abstentions Fred Hanlin

**Mover (Tom Kesina):**

Procedural Motion: to extend speaking time by 2mins for amendment.

Status: Passed

- It is important to be diligent with the level of accountability followed by the NUS.
- All conditions must be enacted by Office Bearers, so not at NatCon, so quite simple.
- ANUSA values minutes availability and values transparency so we must seek that from the NUS.
- We must require that all national executive reports and minutes from all of 2016 and 2017 become available like they are within ANUSA.

- There is no official record of what is passed and what is not, having that on the website is the bare minimum for accountability.
- The returning officer must be independent and not a part of a faction; the last RO was allegedly kicked out because allegedly tempered with proxies and allegedly got alcohol for delegates.
- There must be a published guide on 'how to natcon'; been requested for three years since Laura Campbell; Office Bearers are on a full time salary and it's ridiculous that they haven't written something like that using part of their time to do so.
- I'd like to see the current budget once approved to be published; it's what ANUSA does and so reasonable to suggest this.
- I respect taking in good faith, however with all due respect, the history doesn't play out this way. We need conditions.

**Secunder: Howard**

This is the bare minum that we'd expect from any student organistion let alone a national student body. If there are any grievances please speak on it. This is a very basic and easy way to achieve things on accreditation and make NUS more accountable.

**Speakers List**

**(F)James Connolly**

ANUSA tends to do negotiation with NUS, nothing controversial there, but there will need to have conversation with executive to establish if this can happen; it may need to be brought up at another SRC. I shall revisit after conversations with NUS to adjust particulars.

**Questions to the amended motion 2 as a whole.**

**Q: Implication if this motion vote is a no?**

R: Process of accreditation to NUS will give us the initial fee and we will negotiate to set fee. If the SRC votes no then leaving discretion to the exec as not setting anything, if we present to the NUS with \$0, that is likely to be rejected

**Motion 3:** that the SRC endorses the decision to award the following honouria: Jeevan Haikerwal \$4,000, Elisa Lu \$4,000.

Moved: Harry Feng

Seconded: Cameron Allan

Status: Passed

*Votes noted: Nick Sifinotis Abstention*

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT MOVED: that the SRC endorses the decision to award the following honouria: Jeevan Haikerwal \$4,000, Elisa Lu \$4,000, Phillipa \$3000 and Ryan \$3000 with 25% honouria contingent on an adequate handover.

Mover (Cameron Allan):

- What they received last year, once handovers completed we will pay them.
- Amount prescribed in contracts, confirming that transfer of money.



Secunder (Harry Feng):  
I wave my speaking rights.

**Questions**

Q: Who decides what is adequate handover?

A: Me.

Q: What about Bolwen, does he get paid?

A: For context, Bolwen Fu was our logistic coordinator; he is awarded but does not need to be affirmed by SRC.

---

**Motion 4:** That the SRC endorses ANUSA's 2017 sponsorship arrangement with Murrays Pty Ltd.

Moved: Harry Feng  
Seconded: James Connolly  
Status: Passed

**Mover (Harry Feng):**

There is nothing new here, just affirming the sponsorship deal with Murray's. This is until Feb 1<sup>st</sup> 2018 to give next executive time to negotiate new deal. There will be a performance review after this semester to discuss any changes that may need to be made.

**Secunder (James Connolly):**

I wave my speaking rights.

---

**Motion 5:** That the SRC endorse the creation of a Mature Age Student Committee.

Moved: James Connolly  
Seconded: Harry Feng  
Status: Passed

Mover (James Connolly):

This is in response to the point raised by Tom at SRC 1 in relation to affirming what's been done so far with the establishment of the Mature Aged Student's Committee. There isn't really a forum that existed where they could be represented, it's incumbent on us to gain their insights to improve delivery of social program.

Secunder (Harry Feng):

We represent all undergraduate students, and mature aged students are undergraduates so thus we must represent them too.

**Questions**

Q: Are there any further governance arrangements?

A: There is nothing in the ANUSA constitution about committees, there are no guidelines. So, this committee is to focus on social events, setting up working group, conscious of need for TOR.

---

Q: Is this a collaboration with PARSA?

A: PARSA is involved and invited to events; I'd rather it just be undergrad students however mature aged students might prefer PARSA social program – so collaboration important for insights however priorities are undergraduate students.

Q: This retrospective authorisation of things, that seems strange to me, does it to you?

A: In regards to this particular motion, it's for SRC oversight as it was raised by Tom. It is retrospectively but there is nothing relating to this in the constitution, there is no question on governance.

---

**Motion 6:** That the SRC formally retrospectively endorses the Education Committee's campaign to reform Centrelink.

Moved: Jessy Wu

Seconded: James Connolly

Status: Passed

**Mover (Jessy Wu):**

Over the summer, we ran a campaign in response to stories in the media; we had to respond quickly so we could capitalise on the media attention to the issue and make the most of it; I sought the endorsement of the SRC of this campaign via Slack and Facebook group so this is just formalizing this.

**Seconded (James Connolly):**

I wave my speaking rights.

**Questions**

Q: Does this retrospective authorisation of things feel strange to you?

A: All the campaigns I run are showed to and sought approval of the executive, if not at least James. It was important to speak to the issue at the time so have to see retrospectively now.

---

**Motion 7:** That the SRC formally retrospectively endorses the Education Committee's campaign to oppose the proposed changes to penalty rate legislation.

Moved: Jessy Wu

Seconded: James Connolly

Status: Passed

**Mover (Jessy Wu):**

Refer to my report attached to the agenda. Cuts to penalty rates affects a lot of students who depend on them to be able to financially support themselves. We should endorse the compensation, so organised a media release at the time without moving it in an SRC so t capture the media attention on it during the break.

**Seconded (James Connolly):**

I wave my speaking rights.

---

**Motion 8:** That the SRC formally retrospectively endorses the Education Committee's campaign to improve the representation of Indigenous culture and knowledges at ANU.

Moved: Jessy Wu  
Seconded: Makayla-May Brinckley.  
Status: Passed

**Mover (Jessy Wu):**

We started this before Australia Day to capture the media attention, and it is on-going. It has now been taken nationally by the NUS ATSI Officer. We got confirmation through emails and via Slack and acknowledges the work that has been done by the ATSI Officer.

**Seconded (Makayla-May Brinkley):**

Very proud of this campaign and what it stands for. Very proud of its success. Thank you to all who helped.

**Questions**

Q: Who has authority to approve these campaigns?

A: Given the nature of activism you are responding to things not at times where we meet as an SRC and you need to cease on moment – education committee and department do act as decision makers on the fly. I believe I have acted in line of mandate on which I was elected and only run campaigns aligned with that. The SRC is empowered to call us out on any instances going against this and we can revise such matters.

A (*Kat-constitutional perspective*): I will take this on notice, section 19 (5) specifies how policy must be put through an executive meeting was first, discussed and ratified, this motion is out of way of formality.

---

[The Chair passes to Cam to allow Kat to give move the following motion. Cam's nomination was not subject to dissent]

**Motion 9:** That the SRC confirm the election of Winson Widarto to the position of Department Officer.

Moved: Kat Reed  
Seconded: James Connolly  
Status: Passed

**Mover (Kat Reed):**

This is exactly the same as the motions at SRC1; Winson only being confirmed now has it hadn't been ratified and passed in the collective prior to SRC1. You cannot vote no.

**Seconded (James Connolly):**

Winson's great.

**Questions**

Q: What happens if I try to vote no?

A: You can't.

[The Chair passes back Kat not subject to dissent]

---

**Motion 10:** That the ANU Students' Association endorse the Save the Arts campaign, calling on the University Council to subsidise external venue hire for ANU theatre performances during the time period of Union Court development to an amount comparable to the ANU Arts Centre rates.

Moved: Cameron Allan  
Seconded: Julia Beard  
Status: Passed

**Mover (Cameron Allan):**

- We have re-vamped the save the arts campaign in response to the university's decision to not subsidise funding of alternative performance venues.
- Costs will be increased, and it is extremely inconvenient for all clubs.
- The university is going back on their word once again, and we need to hold them accountable.
- We are mobilizing colleges and clubs and societies; and talking to relevant parties involved.
- If you vote against you hate arts.

**Seconded (Julia Beard):**

I support and agree with everything Cam has said. Please vote yes, very important venues are subsidised.

**Speaker's List**

**(F)Holly**

The Women's Department is going to run the first ever Women's Revue this year and we don't have the budget to hire a venue that isn't subsidised by the university. Could our revue be in jeopardy.

---

**Item 6: Other Business**

**Motion:** That the SRC delegate to a student representative the task of gathering the substantive, distinct points that were made during this debate and make this available to the NUS.

Moved: Holly Zhang  
Seconded: Tanika Sibal  
Status: Passed

**Mover (Holly Zhang):**

This is important for good governance and transparency, also sets a good precedent. We are engaging in the debate at making NUS aware of why we voted in a specific way.

**Seconded (Tanika Sibal):**  
I waive my speaking rights.

**Speaker's List**

**(F)Tom K**

This is a great idea to bring together our thoughts into a document, and it is generally good practice.

**Questions**

Q: Will the SRC see it again before it goes to NUS?

A: Yes once the report is compiled, it will be in the relevant upcoming SRC agenda.

---

**Item 7: Meeting Close**

The next meeting of the Student Representative Council is scheduled to be on Tuesday, 18th April 2017 at 6pm in the Law Link Theatre.

Meeting Close: 9.43pm

~