



1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

Lucy welcomed everyone and acknowledged that UWA is situated on Noongar land. She paid her respects to Noongar elders past and present, and acknowledged the Noongar people remain the spiritual and cultural custodians of their land and that they continue to practice their beliefs, languages, values and knowledge.

1.0 Attendance

Maddie Mulholland (Guild President), Tom Burke (Treasurer), Michael Kabondo (Secretary), Charlie Viska (Vice President), Lucy Moyle (Chair), Jack Looby (SOC President), Megan Lee (PAC President), Ben Martin (OGC), Brad Forbes (OGC), Jesse Martino (OGC), Joanne Lim (OGC), Reece Gherardi (Queer Officer), Laura Mwiragua (Women's Officer), Emma Boogaardt (Education Council President), Jacky Chiang (OGC), Nick Brown (OGC), Chad Bensky (OGC), Fraser Windsor (Queer Officer), Kate Prendergast (Pelican Editor).

1.1 Apologies

Kenneth Foo (ISS), Shyaam Patel (RSD President), Nick Brown (OGC), Torey Rickerby (Sports Representative).

1.2 Proxies

Jonathan Heir (for Tyson McEwan), Matthew Alexander (for Steph Munro), Cameron Mitchell (for Emily Law), Nevin Jayawardena (for Peter Derbyshire).

1.3 Observers

None

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None

3.0 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

3.1 Guild Council Meeting 27th April 2016

3.2 Guild Council Meeting 30th March 2016.

Approved via circular

4.0 APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

4.1 Catering and Tavern

4.2 Equity and Diversity

4.3 Student Services

4.4 Volunteering and Community Engagement

4.5 Welfare and Advocacy

Jack Looby asked if it was possible to get a template for committee minutes for consistency?

Lucy said that she would organise that.

Approved

5.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

None

6.0 DIRECTORS' REPORTS

6.1 Managing Director's Report

Report as Tabled.

6.2 Associate Director of Commercial Report

Report as Tabled.

6.3 Finance Director Report

Report as Tabled.

6.4 Associate Director of Student Services Report

Report as Tabled.

Approved

7.0 REPORTS

7.1 Guild President

Report as Tabled.

7.2 Vice-President

Report as Tabled.

7.3 Secretary

Report as Tabled.

7.4 Treasurer

Report as Tabled.

7.5 Education Council President

Report as Tabled.

7.6 Public Affairs Council President

Report as Tabled.

7.7 Societies Council President

Report as Tabled.

7.8 Women's Department

Report as Tabled.

7.9 Welfare Department



Report as Tabled.

Maddie noted that she would ask Emily to update the report before it is published on the Guild website.

7.10 Environment Department

Report as Tabled.

7.11 International Student Services

No report submitted.

7.12 Queer Department

Report as Tabled.

7.13 Guild Sports Representative

No report submitted.

7.14 WASAC Chair

Report as Tabled.

7.15 Postgraduate Student's Association President

Report as Tabled.

7.16 Residential Student's Department President

No report submitted.

7.17 Pelican Editors

Report as Tabled.

7.18 PROSH Directors

Report as Tabled.

7.19 Relay For Life Chair

Report as Tabled.

7.20 Volunteering & Community Engagement Committee Chair

No report submitted.

7.21 Councillor Reports

None.

Approved

8.0 QUESTION TIME

Reece asked Maddie how the new name for Reid Café was going?

Maddie said it was with the elder and they have responded, the motion will be moved next month.



Reece asked Charlie if we could make the heads of all the collectives as standing invitees at Council?

Maddie said we're considering this at Governance but at the moment they are reporting through Charlie.

Jesse asked if everything is on track on the timeline with the Guild Regulations?

Maddie said not really, but we are on track now.

9.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE

9.1 That Guild Council approves the creation of a Standing Committee of Guild Council, the "Audit and Risk Committee", operating under the attached terms of reference.

Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Michael Kabondo.

Maddie said we are proposing the creation of a standing committee and then to formalise it in Guild Regulations later. The Audit and Risk Committee will meet quarterly and to discuss budgeting and our performance and to review our audits and help us develop and keep on top of our strategy and risk. At the moment we don't have any approved risk appetite or procedures, the only thing we have discussed is SSAF. So it is important that we start to go into this space, we are a multimillion dollar organisation, we need independent people who review our accounts. This will be a committee to provide relevant input and we require that the members be alumni of the Guild, and that they have understanding of the organisation, so they can provide us with input but also have an appreciation of what the Guild is and what drives the Guild, and they can tailor their input based on that. We are proposing the creation of a nominations working group comprised of the President, two members of SRC who will probably receive suggestions from management. They would have a three-year term with potential extension. This is something we need for our own oversight and is something the University Executive have asked us to do. So that is the rationale behind it.

Charlie spoke in favour of the motion. He likes the idea of engaging our alumni.

Ben wanted to clarify if these external positions were volunteer based?

Maddie said yes.

Jesse asked the reason why the Chair isn't the Guild President?

Maddie said, in any organisation the Chair of the Audit Committee management are only standing invites, which she is. What it allows is for the conversation to be driven by external people and not dictated by management.

Jack asked about the composition. This would be the only committee where students didn't have the majority vote. What was the rationale behind it?

Maddie replied. The purpose is that students don't get the majority vote. The purpose of this committee is to give independent oversight of the operations, so they would have to have the

majority vote. They don't have decision powers; they can only make recommendations for Guild Council to then consider.

Tony added, it's to help keep management and the Guild in check. It is also there to review risk.

Maddie was going to make an amendment to add affirmative action to the composition of the committee.

The motion was put as amended.

Passed Unanimously

9.2 That Guild Council approves the introduction of CCTV in the Tavern, subject to a use and access policy being implemented

Moved: Tom Burke; Seconded: Maddie Mulholland

Tom noted as mentioned at the last Council meeting, we discussed the possibility of CCTV being introduced. He thinks it's important that this Council consider the question of bringing it in, so he has moved this motion in the affirmative. He is opposed to introducing it at this point, because we are a student tavern celebrating student culture, without having to worry about whether they are being monitored. There have been arguments made for CCTV, and it is important that they be considered, because it is about protecting our staff and security. People can make allegations against these people and without CCTV it could result in false prosecutions, at the moment this has not happened yet. It is also the case that there are always witnesses at the tavern. Other arguments 'for' say it is standard practise and the fact that it might become imposed on licenced venues, so we might as well do it now. He thinks we should for now reject this motion because students also seem not to want it introduced.

Maddie differed her speaking rights to the Tavern Manager, Hayden.

Hayden said he was the person that put forward the idea of getting CCTV in the Tavern. The reasons behind it, personally is that he feels we have a duty of care to our customers and our staff. The reason we need it is that if staff gets assaulted or allegations are made against them it can essentially affect the rest of their life. Another reason would be to check the staff with their RSA, he would like a camera pointed at the bar. There's all these reasons to why CCTV should be introduced, and it won't be to spy on students. CCTV is a tool used in the case of something happening and we need to go back and look at it. It is Council's responsibility to create a usage policy. It keeps Hayden honest as it is a \$10,000 fine to him personally if anything is found to be done wrong, and can assist us responding to allegations against the Guild that have the possibility of resulting in a fine and possible loss of license. It is important to have CCTV there to back what we say, video footage doesn't lie. With renovations about to happen, it's going to get a lot busier and as it gets busier unfortunately more problems arise. So it is better to get it now, than have something happen and we say we should've got it.

Reece asked Hayden if a use and access policy has been developed?

Hayden said they hasn't.

Lucy asked if we had any cost estimates?

Hayden said we are currently looking at quotes.

Lucy asked about the coverage of these cameras?

Hayden responded. One at the gate, the courtyard, main floor, mezzanine and behind the bar.

The motion was put to debate.

Dennis spoke for the motion. He is in favour of these because, firstly we need to acknowledge that Hayden's opinion on this is highly relevant. Secondly, the current way the laws are going, CCTV will slowly be getting enforced so we might get it forced on us and in that circumstance it might not be the way we want it.

Julian spoke in favour. He was the manager of a nightclub a few years ago - people say things and get angry when their drunk, and they make allegations. 9/10 times they are wrong and the times they have been right we were glad that they had the footage and it could be dealt with appropriately, whether it's theft or assault. We are a Board and in order to protect risk to the organisation we should introduce CCTV.

Ben spoke against the motion. He thought we should consider the atmosphere of the Tavern is different to that of your typical nightclub. He agrees completely with Tom's sentiments. He thinks University life should be kept as such, and the inclusion of CCTV will change the environment probably for the negative. Unless there is an epidemic of violence he doesn't know about then we should introduce it. Specifically, with the change of laws that should be a bridge to cross when we get to it.

Reece said he agreed with Ben. The fact is that Hayden says we don't have a use and access policy and it seems quite silly to put through a motion with no usage policy being developed. He also agrees with what Ben says about the atmosphere of the Tavern, is it really fair to treat students like criminals that need to be surveilled? Because students will see us as the "Nanny Guild" and is that how we want to be perceived as? Speaking from the perspective of an LGBTI+ student, we have a policy in the Queer department of no photos being taken at our events without explicit permission. The footage would not be seen by anyone, but if we were to hold an event at the Tav, people would see cameras and might be uncomfortable coming.

Tony was a club manager many years ago. He can attest to the value of why CCTV does save you and your patrons. It's not only about the venue, it's about conduct and he has been in situations where people have benefited from CCTV. At the end of the day, people are discussing the atmosphere of the Tavern, but you have to remember that in the eyes of the law our Tavern is no different to The Claremont or something you see in Northbridge or Victoria Park. Your liquor licence is the same and if your conduct is unacceptable it doesn't matter whether or not you have CCTV, you will be shut down. Secondly, if you don't have anything to protect the licence itself, you don't have a place to have a culture of drinking again and it wouldn't have the chance to come back on campus.

Maddie spoke for the motion. What she wanted to make clear was that there are two approaches to the motion. People against the motion who are looking at it from a student use of the facility perspective, and people for the motion looking at it from a responsibility to the Guild, our staff and provide a safe environment for students. She thinks we need to balance that, and

we need to explain to students why this is in their best interest. She thinks the policy that would be created, will probably only allow Hayden access to footage, and only when a formal complaint has been made. It is there to protect Hayden, the Guild and Students. This is our role in the organisation, in that we are sure we are looking after our staff and our operations and that we are ultimately looking after students. We clearly do have a difficult job to explain to students who are anti-CCTV, but as a board she agrees with Julian that it is a bit of a no-brainer.

Megan said, her biggest thing is that most students won't even notice the difference, like Tony said most people go to The Claremont and don't care about CCTV. She is also sick and tired of apologising for this student culture that is harming for other students, a lot of you don't know but as a young woman in a licensed venue it is terrifying to be around young intoxicated men, and not have CCTV there to back up your claims. This is not just for women, it's for anyone in a licensed venue. CCTV is there to corroborate stories and allegations made.

Emma asked if Tom was moving the motion because he was voting against it?

Dennis said he was happy to move it.

The Motion was amended.

That Guild Council approves the introduction of CCTV in the Tavern, subject to a use and access policy being implemented

Moved: Dennis Venning; Seconded: Maddie Mulholland

Dennis passed his right of reply to Tom.

Tom said he still stands by his conclusion and given student attitudes to CCTV, we don't have compelling reasons to have CCTV. The only reason he doesn't think this should be implemented is because nothing serious has happened. In response to Dennis' point in pre-empting it being enforced, he thinks we would have a warning if this was going to happen. He will be voting against it.

The motion was put. **Passed as amended**

For: Maddie Mulholland, Michael Kabondo, Charlie Viska, Nevin Jayawardena, Lucy Moyle, Megan Lee, Brad Forbes, Jesse Martino, Steph Munro, Joanne Lim, Laura Mwiragua, Emma Boogaardt, Jacky Chiang, Nick Brown, Chad Bensky, Julian Coleman, Jess Porter-Langson.

Against: Tom Burke, Matthew Alexander, Jonathan Heir, Ben Martin, Jack Looby.

Abstain: None

9.3 That Guild Council condemns the parts of the Federal Budget that will impact negatively on students:

- a) \$2 billion cuts to higher education funding over the next 5 years;
- b) \$154 million cuts to the Higher Education Participation Program;
- c) Total defunding of the Office of Learning & Teaching; and
- d) the PaTH internship program that will pay young people below minimum wage.

Moved: Charlie Viska; Seconded: Emma Boogaardt

Charlie said we hope you've had the chance to research this. He quickly ran through why he thinks each part of the budget will negatively impact students. Firstly, the cuts to higher education in general, we know it is an underfunded area in general so this is inappropriate. He thinks the PaTH internship program is inappropriate for a number of reasons, first of all people doing the work deserve to be paid for it, otherwise he thinks its clear exploitation. It could be good that the government is trying to incentivise employers to employ people looking for work, but he doesn't think that it's a justification for workers not to have the protection afforded to them. They still deserve rights such as Superannuation and other rights. These aren't internships this is exploitation.

Emma said she's assuming everyone is alright with the first three sections and PaTH is the most controversial thing; she would focus on that. A lot of people have been saying that \$4 is better than no dollars an hour, that's true but the problem with this system is that it's bad for people involved in the program and people outside. \$4 an hour can't pay your rent and utilities and you're in a really exploitive situation because you have no guaranteed job at the end of it. If the problem the government has is that there aren't enough jobs for young people, this isn't creating jobs, it's putting people in jobs that already existed but for \$4 an hour. If the problem is that people need more training to get better jobs then we should be investing in education and training, not just employing people for less than minimum wage. Essentially, the PaTH program is bad for students trying to find a job who now don't have proper training and now struggling to pay rent, and also bad for students who are currently employed at the award rate because they will be less likely to find a job.

The motion was open for debate.

Chad said we are a Guild of students so we should take a dogmatic anti-cut to University funding stance, and kind of disregard the economic reasons, it is our duty to always seek the best outcome for students. When he first heard about the PaTH program he was on the fence, but in doing more research he thinks it is a terrible exploitive scheme, in the long run will stop a lot of long term employment. He is very supportive of the motion and thinks these are the kind of motions that should be passed at Guild Council because they are relevant and well thought about.

Ben spoke against the motion. Similarly, to Emma, Ben would focus on part (d) of the motion as it is the most controversial. Essentially, he is very supportive of the PaTH program. It shows how out of touch he is with with how the Left are thinking these days, because when the Treasurer announced the program he thought people would be overjoyed by this program. Essentially, paying people to get an education in the form of an internship is how he views the program. He disagrees that it's paying people below minimum wage because the amount they are being payed is above what they're already being paid for income assistance and additional payments. It's a voluntary program for both suppliers and workers so you are able to opt in and out as you see fit. The reason it is not below minimum wage is because it is on top of what they are already receiving. So it is not exploitative, it's a voluntary program which students or anyone can opt into, to develop themselves get an internship and expand their employability potential.

Tom said, the only problem with this motion is with part (d), he doesn't think that it will negatively impact on students. He thinks it's going to negatively impact on people in the workforce or looking for proper work, as they are likely to be replaced by these interns. As a student he thinks it might be a positive thing because you can do it whilst you're studying. He

isn't completely convinced that this will negatively impact students. He requested an amendment to split the motion.

Charlie was amendable to add "that will impact negatively on students and young people".

The motion was amended.

Jess said the only reason she's against this motion is because she thinks from a broader students' view, she doesn't want the Guild to seem like we're presenting a biased point of view on politics. She knows from discussing it with other students is that they see it that way. She proposed an amendment to add specification to the budget section being referred to.

Emma said she was amendable to add "condemns the parts of the Federal Budget outlined in part two".

The motion was amended.

That Guild Council condemns the parts of the Federal Budget outlined in part two, that will impact negatively on students and young people:

- a) \$2 billion cuts to higher education funding over the next 5 years;
- b) \$154 million cuts to the Higher Education Participation Program;
- c) Total defunding of the Office of Learning & Teaching; and
- d) the PaTH internship program that will pay young people below minimum wage.

Moved: Charlie Viska; Seconded: Emma Boogaerdt

Jesse wanted to respond to what Ben said about the program paying students to further their experience. He thinks if you look at the PaTHway program, businesses will get \$1000 to take on the employee, but that does not necessarily mean the employer will take be more incentivised to teach people. That doesn't mean students in those pathways will learn or gain anything meaningful from their internship, they could be given jobs such as filing papers. The second thing Ben said about the program being voluntary, he doesn't think anything voluntary doesn't mean it's not exploitative.

Ben responded. Essentially Jesse spoke about having the incentive for a supplier to train. He wasn't sure if Jesse knew what being part of an internship was, but that's what people do - they do the filing, the cutting etc. It's being around the environment which is the benefit. So he does see huge value from that. With respect to him saying that because it is voluntary, it can't be exploitative. He agrees that they can be exploitation in the work place, but it is still technically an opt-in, opt-out program. The point he was getting at is that was with the terminology in regards to minimum wage, that's the exploitative part that the motion was referring to. That is not exploitative in a sense because it is on top of what they are receiving.

Charlie replied, saying he does not accept Ben's point that it isn't below minimum wage.

The motion was put. **Passed as amended.**

For: Maddie Mulholland, Michael Kabondo, Charlie Viska, Nevin Jayawardena, Lucy Moyle, Megan Lee, Jesse Martino, Steph Munro, Joanne Lim, Laura Mwiragua, Emma Boogaerdt, Jacky Chiang, Nick Brown, Chad Bensky, Tom Burke, Jonathan Heir, Jack Looby.

Against: Jess Porter-Langson, Julian Coleman.

Abstain: *Matthew Alexander, Ben Martin, Brad Forbes.*

**9.4 That Guild Council awards Derwent Construction as the building contractor for the UWA Student Guild Tavern's internal refurbishment within the agreed budget of \$265,000.
*Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Tom Burke***

A motion was put to go in camera. Carried.

The motion was put. **Passed Unanimously.**

**9.5 That Guild Council endorses the 2016 Guild Masterplan.
*Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Charlie Viska***

Tony said as you know we have a masterplan for the Guild. The Guild has been in this location and The Ref being the original part of the Guild, and then secondary parts since the 70's. With any development and organisation given that we do own physical assets they do become our responsibility to review and upgrade. This is a review of what we think would be put forward to provide a better experience for students on campus.

Maddie added, the first Masterplan was created in 2008/2009, it was then revised in 2013 and we are now proposing another provision, taking into account our current situation with what we think students are looking for now. Setting a plan to move forward and start to act on these. The masterplan was then presented to Council.

Maddie said, one thing to add was that we formed an opt-in working group who provided the inspiration for this, and then we worked with the architects to then provide this. She hopes everyone was given adequate opportunity to be involved.

Charlie added that he thinks it's important that we are ready to take this to the University.

The motion was put. **Passed.**

For: *Maddie Mulholland, Michael Kabondo, Charlie Viska, Nevin Jayawardena, Lucy Moyle, Megan Lee, Brad Forbes, Jesse Martino, Steph Munro, Joanne Lim, Laura Mwiragua, Emma Boogaerdt, Jacky Chiang, Nick Brown, Chad Bensky, Julian Coleman, Jess Porter-Langson, Tom Burke, Jack Looby, Jonathan Heir.*

Against: *None*

Abstain: *Matthew Alexander, Ben Martin.*

**9.6 That Guild Council accepts 'Pride Department' as the new name for the Queer Department.
*Moved: Reece Gherardi; Seconded: Charlie Viska (Fraser Windsor)***

Charlie seconded the motion in Fraser's absence.

Reece said for the benefit of those who hadn't read his report. This discussion has been going on for a very long time, he came to UWA last year and this has been going on before he got here. We had a special General meeting on Tuesday the 26th April, where we discussed what names we wanted, and a full list of names discussed can be found in his report. At the end of the meeting we had a vote, and the name Pride Department won, so this wasn't an executive decision. In his

report he put some concerns about the name Queer Department. We think changing the name will expand our reach.

Charlie said, before the change he was for the name Queer Department, but taking into consideration what Reece outlined, he thinks it's better to go with what the majority wanted.

The motion was put. **Passed Unanimously**

9.7 That Guild Council approves the capex expenditure for the Tavern electrical board - valued to \$40k.

Moved: Tom Burke; Seconded; Maddie Mulholland

This was a motion without notice.

Maddie said basically this is part of the Tav refurbishment, it's a budgeted cost, we just need to release the fund. We have now received all the quotes and can go ahead with it. It needs to be done as part of the refurbishment, so it can't wait until next meeting because we will be in the full swing of the refurbishment by then. So by its nature it couldn't be on the agenda because we only just received all the final quotes to confirm that this is the amount we will need, which is \$10,000 under budget, and it is really urgent because it needs to be considered before next Council meeting.

Lucy moved that Council consider the motion. **Motion carried.**

Jack asked if this was part of the Capital Budget we approved in December?

Maddie said yes, we are just requesting the funds be released and notifying Council that we have come \$10,000 under budget.

The motion was put. **Passed Unanimously.**

10.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

10.1 Guild Social Media

Jess said she briefly touched on it before. This is mainly to do with budget post, she thinks we were trying hard to boost student engagement. The Guild are perceived to be very political from a student perspective, and she thinks we need not to encourage it as much as possible. In relation to the post itself it didn't have a link to the budget itself. It looked as if we were giving them our opinion and not giving them a chance to read the budget themselves.

Maddie said she made the post, she is the only student with access to the Guild Facebook page. If you ever have any edits, she does want to hear them. She got an email from Steph regarding some of the wording used and she explained to her that she tried to use neutral language. She thinks a link to the budget would've been a really good idea. Additionally, she reminded Council that we are a student union and sometimes we are going to have to put out a political view on things, so we can't not engage with that at all.

10.2 Proposed changes to senate representative make-up.

As Maddie noted in her report, with the proposed make up of student representatives in Senate what would be the preferred option by Council. The Council discussed this and made the recommendation for the wording “2 students, as elected according to the regulations”.

10.3 June Guild Council Meeting Date.

Due to exams and holidays we need to change the date of the next Council meeting to ensure Quorum. It was decided to do it the week earlier, tentatively 23rd June.

11.0 CLOSE / NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 29th June 2016 at 6.00pm. Please contact the Guild Secretary (secretary@guild.uwa.edu.au) with apologies or proxies. All office bearers will be available from 5.30pm. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.

